DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 646 EA 011 127

AUTHOR Lambert, Kenneth, Ed.
TITLE The Education Service: In or Out of Local Government? Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the British Educational Administration Society (6th, University of Birmingham, England, September 23-24, 1977).
INSTITUTION British Educational Administration Society.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 115p.; Not available in paper copy due to small print of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Local Government; Organization; Political Power; *School District Autonomy
IDENTIFIERS *England

ABSTRACT

This conference focused on the present position of British education within local government and whether schools can function effectively under local control. Issues discussed included the question of whether the schools were providing industry with employees having appropriate academic ability and social skills, the question of whether educational standards were falling, and doubts about whether locally run schools could provide the service that a nation with serious economic problems needed. The issues of autonomy and accountability were also touched on. The volume begins with an introduction by Kenneth Lambert. It also includes "Higher and Further Education and Local Government" by Reverend Dr. Canon George Tolley, and responses to it by Professor Meredydd Hughes and Harry Gray. "The Schools' Position in Relation to the 'Great Debate' on Education" by Robert Spooner is followed by responses by John Sayer and Patrick Bailey. Geoffrey Winter spoke on "Administration," and responses to this talk were offered by Derek Williams and Kenneth Lambert. "The Way Ahead" by John Stewart was followed by responses by Michael Harrison and Leslie Bowles. "Conference Review 1" was offered by Roger Brown and "Conference Review 2" was supplied by D. A. Howell. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Education Service: In or Out of Local Government?

The Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference of the British Educational Administration Society, arranged by the Midlands Branch at the University of Birmingham, 23rd - 24th September 1977.

Edited for the Society by
Kenneth Lambert,
Headmaster of Great Barr School,
Birmingham.

CONTENTS

Introduction

Kenneth Lambert,
Headmaster, Great Barr School, Birmingham.

Higher and Further Education and Local Government

Rev. Dr. Canon George Tolley,
Principal, Sheffield Polytechnic.

Responses:

Professor Meredydd Hughes,
Professor of Education (Social and Administrative Studies), University of Birmingham.

Harry Gray,
Principal Lecturer, Anglian Regional Management Centre, Romford, Essex.

The Schools' Position in relation to the "Greate Debate" on Education

Robert Spooner,
Headmaster, Foxwood School, Leeds.

Responses:

John Sayer,
Principal, Banbury School.

Patrick Bailey,
Senior Lecturer in Education in the Department of Education, University of Leicester.

I

Administration

Geoffrey Winter,
Principal Lecturer at the Sheffield City Polytechnic,
formerly Chief Education Officer of North Riding.

Responses:

Derek Williams,
Director of the Gloucestershire College of
Higher Education, formerly Chief Education Officer,
Avon.

Kenneth Lambert,
Headmaster of Great Barr School, Birmingham.

The Way Ahead

John Stewart,
Director of the Institute of Local Government Studies
at the University of Birmingham.

Responses:

Michael Harrison,
Chief Education Officer, Sheffield.

Leslie Bowles,
Chairman of Bedfordshire Education Committee.

A Review of Group Reports

The Conference in Retrospect

Conference Review 1:

Roger Brown, Department of Industry, formerly
with the ILEA, and was Secretary of the
William Tyndale Enquiry.

Conference Review 2:

D.A. Howell, Senior Lecturer,
Department of Educational Administration,
University of London Department of Education.

Conference Participants

II

INTRODUCTION

Kenneth Lambert,
Headmaster, Great Barr School, Birmingham.

The theme of the Sixth Annual Conference of the British Educational Administration Society was 'Local Government - Education, in or out'. Whilst it was hoped that the conference would discuss a review of the present position of education within local government and whether or not it was functioning effectively in the local context, it was recognised that this was but part of a much larger problem.

During the previous year the education service, particularly the schools, had become the subject of considerable criticism. The service did not seem to be providing industry with recruits of appropriate academic ability and with suitable social skills. The general public were expressing doubts about educational standards, particularly literacy and numeracy. The Prime Minister was concerned enough to make a national statement, Shirley Williams instituted the Great Debate to be followed by the now famous Green Paper. Inevitably the charges were countered by the professionals. There was also some doubt as to whether education within the local government sector could any longer provide the service which a nation with economic problems of some magnitude currently needed. Perhaps these criticisms were all reflections of the more articulate society which was discussed at some length during the conference itself.

In the year preceding the conference the discussions at national level gathered momentum. The Taylor Report and the William Tyndale Enquiry, both emphasised the developing concern firstly about standards, and secondly, and perhaps more importantly about autonomy of educational institutions and accountability. All this was added to the problems of an ailing economy and cutbacks in public expenditure. Whilst the abandonment of corporate management by some authorities was based on financial stringency

rather than on reasons of managerial incompetence, there was considerable criticism of the corporate management principle or perhaps rather the way in which it was being operated. This inevitably became a major issue at the conference itself.

At the conference the issues became strangely enough both polarised and diffused. Firstly there was an emphasis on the national - local ends of the administrative continuum and only occasionally did such alternatives as regionalism see the light of conference day. Secondly, there seemed to be a concern with a wide range of issues connected tenuously with the main conference theme - corporate management, institutional autonomy, common curriculum and accountability. Perhaps all these were a reflection of the perennial theme through conferences of the Society. There were constant references in papers, responses and in discussion groups to autonomy and accountability. Whether any new organisational structures could best serve the interests of the education service might well, it was suggested by Tom Bone, be the subject of some research by the Society. Some possible alternatives were suggested by the Society. Some possible alternatives were suggested by Councillor Bowles in his response to John Stewart's paper.

Some members expressed concern about the Society becoming merely another pressure group rather than an impartial body. It might be worth quoting last year's introduction:

> 'As one of the very few bodies in our often fragmented service to encompass members of all levels and branches of education, the Society seems uniquely fitted to fulfil such a significant role, bearing in mind also its lack of attachment to any sectional interest or interests within the service.'

These proceedings and the Conference on which they are based depend heavily on the contribution of certain bodies and individuals. The Midlands Branch Committee of the Society was largely responsible for the administration and organisation of the Conference. Brian Somers was responsible for the financial arrangements,

Ann Pattison for the domestic arrangements. The distribution of papers to conference members was the result of a great deal of hard work on the part of Jean Vale. The ten discussion group chairmen produced excellent reports, a reflection of their wisdom and skill in guiding discussion through such difficult areas. Their contribution is acknowledged at the end of the section which summarises these reports.

HIGHER AND FURTHER EDUCATION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Rev. Dr. Canon George Tolley,
Principal, Sheffield City Polytechnic.

Bickering and running battles have been going on for years about local authority control of what is quaintly called the 'public sector' of higher education (as though the Universities were not completely dependent upon public money). The new elements in the situation are firstly, the distractions which have followed in the wake of local government reorganisation, compounded and overlaid by the imposition of cash limits. And, secondly, a growing chorus of questioning about the effectiveness and objectives of higher and further education (not to mention the schools). The question that is now being asked, more and more, unthinkable even 20 years ago is: "Do the local authorities have the will to continue in education?".

I am one of those who has consistently applauded the achievements of the local education authorities in higher and further education. If that sounds like a prelude to an obituary, it is not intended to be. There is a great deal of life and vigour and promise in the patient yet. Of course, there are local authorities who have miserable records of virtual non-achievement whose hall-mark is true to the traditions of the Poor Law. Of course, there are elected members who ought not to be allowed within 10 miles of a school or college and whose blundering lack of understanding is matched only by their breathtaking arrogance. And, of course, there are local government officers who have kept their heads down for so long, as a matter of principle, that they have forgotten what it is like to look ahead and see where they are walking. But, and it is a big but, in spite of shortcomings the achievements in higher and further education have been truly remarkable, in quantity and quality. They show that, for all its faults, local government can deliver the goods. They are not the goods that have pleased and satisfied everybody, but, by and large, they have been sound goods.

So, why the unease, an unease that is undoubtedly genuine? Partly, I suppose, because it reflects and arises to some extent from the national unease about what is felt as a loss of sense of purpose; we hear a great deal of talk about consensus but seem determined to engage in long and bitter conflict in order to achieve it. More directly, the unease arises from a widespread conviction that the 1974 reorganisation was a palliative only and cannot provide a sound and lasting structure. Indeed, how could it, when there was an assiduous determination not to consider fundamental matters of finance and accountability until after re-organisation?

But what of education, in particular and, since it is my brief to consider higher and further education, what special issues arise in these areas? It would be easy, but it would take a very long time, to run down a list of major concerns, some of which would justify a very detailed treatment.

There is the Oakes Committee. There is the massive reorganisation now in progress, following the decision to cut back teacher training. What of the future of the Advanced Further Education Pool? Is the statutory position of Education Committees becoming seriously undermined through the pressures and procedures of corporate management? Should there be a new Education Act to bring about basic changes in structure and relationships? And so on, the list could be extended indefinitely.

I wish to address myself to three questions, which I would claim subsume many of the current concerns about education and local government. They are:

> Given that the central government has a prime role to play in education, is there a need for a buffer between central government and the institutions that form the delivery system and, if so, what sort of buffer?
>
> What expertise, outside of the colleges, can a local education authority (or the local authorities collectively)

provide to justify control of the colleges?

What is meant by accountability?

Education in this country is proclaimed as a national system locally administered. That is as true of further and higher education as it is of the schools (although the Scottish administration of higher education differs essentially from that in England and Wales). The Universities, although publicly financed by a vote of Parliament retain autonomy with the University Grants Committee as a buffer. In short, there has been a refusal to accept "State" education. We have "State" prisons; we do not have "State" schools or colleges. The administrative distinction is profound. We require and expect the Government to formulate and declare national policies. We demand certain essential freedoms at local and institutional level in implementing these policies. The history of education in this country during the last 100 years and more is that of the maintenance and resolution of tensions created by a national policy without a State system. I do not wish here to enter into arguments about the essential characteristics of an education system in a democracy, although that is what we are concerned with. But it seems to me that certain necessary freedoms must be ensured at local or institutional level. These are:

Freedom of the curriculum
Freedom in making appointments
Freedom to innovate
Freedom in selection of students
Freedom of management
Freedom to challenge national policy

Whilst all these freedoms must co-exist with national policy it has been an essential principle of the administration of education in this country that these freedoms shall be exercised. Maintaining the balance between national dirigisme, which is evidence of a necessary forcefulness of a live and effective Government, (which might become a totally centralised administration in which freedoms are undermined or destroyed), and a fragmented system of

autonomous Kingdoms, unable to implement a national policy, is the constant task of Governments and those in the education service. But, if some buffer is needed between central Government in order to maintain these freedoms, need that buffer be local government? One obvious answer is that it need not be. One could visualise, for example, a system of regional bodies being established, with checks and balances to prevent total domination from the centre, which could undertake the administration of further and higher education. But, of course, we have local government, and because it is there, if for no other reason, we do not work out in detail rival systems to supplant it. There is another reason, of course, that it has achieved much in the past.

But the question that has to be faced is whether local government is the buffer that it claims to be. Furthermore, are there not real dangers that local government in its current trends might be destroying the very freedoms that it should be nurturing? Central government has progressively tightened its control over local government, almost inevitably perhaps as the national exchequer has provided a higher and higher proportion of total local government spending. Each successive protestation of central government about allowing local government freedom to make decisions in the light of local situations has become more distasteful, since it is so patently untrue. The essential freedom afforded to a local authority is more and more becoming that of doing nothing. Apart from a growing measure of central government control, we all have our pet horror stories of the excesses of corporate management, in which centralism has become rampant in local government to the detriment of the good management. Likewise, no doubt, we have our stories of the sillinesses of claims, within a local authority, for institutional or personal autonomy based on an arrogant disregard of the existence of the world. Indeed, it may well be said that, given the pressures under which it operates local government doesn't do at all badly in holding things in some sort of balance. Maybe so. But that is not the point that I am concerned with here. The point at issue is much more basic than that. It is that, given the further and higher education service that has to be administered

and the institutions necessary to provide that service, is there sufficient regard pain in local government to the characteristics and qualities of that service and of those institutions and of the freedoms that must be preserved for both the service and the institutions? There is some evidence to indicate that, in the period following reorganisation, a period of severe restraint as we well know, there has been some disregard of necessary qualities and freedoms. There is some evidence of an impatience with those who have resisted rough shod treatment from either central or local government, believing that certain essential qualities and relationships have to be preserved. One may be forgiven for wondering at the moment whether local government does provide an effective or preferred buffer between central government. One is also justified in asking what is the nature of the controls whilst local government seeks to exercise over the further and higher education service. In asking that question we must consider the nature and level of expertise which is available in local government and the essential interests that expertise supports.

We have seen how a virtually total central control can produce a shambles, as in teacher training. Yet, where were the voices from local government in the years of blatant disregard of future needs? The major employers of teachers are the local authorities, the majority of places for teacher training students were in those colleges of education administered by the local authorities. Did the local authorities themselves have no interest in birth rate projections (with implications for all the services they provide, not merely for teacher training); were the local authorities blind to the efforts of the Houghton settlement or to general economic factors? Why did some local authorities continue, apparently blithely and blindly with yet more buildings for teacher training, when the writing was only too plainly on the wall? Local government must be just as much to blame as central government for the debacle in teacher training; for local authorities built and staffed and equipped colleges and they are the major consumers of the output of those colleges.

We have seen the further education system (with a massive

investment in resources) fail to meet the needs of industry. There continue to be chronic shortages of skills. There is still no firm policy on part-time vocational education. At a time of need for urgent action in resolving deep seated problems in technician education, vital to the needs of the economy of the country, urgency was eschewed and ominous question marks still stand against the actions subsequently taken. Where is the voice of local government in these issues? It will not do to point to the shortcomings of others or to expand upon those things that are not in the control of local government. The Training Services Agency came into being not least because of the partial failure of a service that was administered by local government.

Cost effectiveness is in the air, and has been for a long time, yet there are no dependable statistics relating to inter-institutional costs nor, more basically, is there any general agreement upon the objectives or output of what is being costed. Yet the institutions are in local authority control.

But, it will be said, these things have little or nothing to do with expertise available in local government and everything to do with the aloofness and refusal to listen of the DES. That the DES on occasions is aloof and refuses to listen, I have no doubt but if it always and invariably goes its own way (a statement which could not be sustained), then that can hardly be regarded as anything other than a confession of failure on the part of local government. Where is the expertise within local government which has to be depended upon and made use of by the colleges and polytechnics? Is it expertise that can only be provided through local authorities and is it best provided in this way? It is pointless labouring the pretence that because a part of the money that maintains the institutions comes from the local authority then, of necessity, the institutions concerned must be dependent upon the professional officers and elected members of that authority for the purposes of good management.

As an institution, such as a polytechnic, becomes a larger and more complex organisation, so it finds itself having to call upon a

wider range of professional expertise in order to sustain itself. The expertise required will go well beyond that available in the Education Department of the Authority and it must be called upon and worked with directly, not at second hand through the Education Department. The expertise will be required by way of professional advice and guidance in areas such as: buildings; planning matters; tenancy agreements; legal queries covering a very large field; personal matters; accountancy and financial control; purchasing and so on. Now, smaller and moderately sized colleges do not have the complexity of organisation of a very large college. Their organisational needs may well be met entirely adequately by the professional services that are available within the local authority. It is not at all apparent that the organisational and management needs of the very large organisation are met by the local authority.

A Polytechnic is a large employer, embracing all types of employment from manual to top level professional, utilising all types of employment contract and having a multiplicity of Trades Unions to deal with. The Authority as a whole will have a still wider range of employment and contracts and Unions to deal with. Given the bewildering complexity of employment legislation, the range of employments covered and the sensitivities in industrial relations, I doubt very much whether local government is at all adequately served by its personnel departments.

It certainly cannot be said that the quality of the personnel services made available by a local authority to a large Polytechnic is adequate to the formidable management tasks that have to be undertaken.

When legal advice is needed by a College it is likely to find that individuals who seek the protection or the force of the law can, and indeed do, call upon well organised legal services having at their disposal specialists in the field who are likely to be formidable opponents. The legal resources available to, and made use of, for example, by a Students' Union are altogether more convincing and reassuring than those initially available to the management of

a Polytechnic through the legal department of a local authority.

A City Treasurers department is likely to be much more concerned with exercising its fiduciary responsibilities in relation to a College's accounts and accounting procedures than it is in advising upon and offering professional expertise in management accounting.

Indeed, there appears to be a consistent and considered refusal of local government to face up to the lack of incentives for good management. City Treasurers' Departments must accept a good part of the blame for this. In their eyes good management is spending up to the limits of the annual estimate. Savings that are achieved, for whatever reason, including greater efficiency, are inconvenient and must be punished as unfortunate aberrations.

For too long, the general policy of local authorities has been that of denying large operational organisations in education their own professional staff at the required level, whilst claiming that services required of their staff are available within the authority. It has to be said that in all too many areas they are not available at the required level. If corporate management should have meant anything at all it ought to have meant the availability and provision of required levels of professional expertise in operational management. If corporate management has meant a better definition of policy coupled with a professionally effective implementation through the operational units of local government, then it has to be said that such is not generally apparent.

Of course, it will be said by some that professional officers are dependent upon the politicians for policy. It will, no doubt, also be said that local government has been operating under a siege economy for some time now, that conditions are abnormal and that expenditure cuts have disoriented the management of services. In answer to the second point, it can only be said that times of stringency make it even more necessary to be assured of a high level of expertise to assist towards good management.

If management by crisis becomes a way of life then the outlook is

bleak indeed. The first comment takes us to the heart of accountability and it is to that we will now turn.

The Layfield Committee had a good deal to say about accountability, but finished in the end, with a prescription for accountability that is pretty well unworkable within the present structure of the education service. The Committee said: "...conflicting interests can only be satisfactorily reconciled if whoever is responsible for deciding to spend more or less money on providing a service is also responsible for deciding to raise more or less taxation." "If local authorities are to be accountable they should be responsible to their electorates for both the expenditure they incur and the revenue they raise to finance it, and particularly for increases in both." "If local authorities are to exercise discretion over the way they carry out their functions and to determine the level and pattern of expenditure on them, they should be responsible for finding the money through local taxes for which they are accountable". These statements, and others in the Report, whilst concentrating the mind, ensure, if they are accepted, the demise of local government in education. In further education, there are some strictly local needs which could be met on a local basis. It might be claimed, for example, that all part-time education comes into this category, together with all courses for the 16-19 age group, which might be said to be part of a school-college overlap area. But a momentary examination is sufficient to show that thereare national needs superimposed upon local needs. The latter do not necessarily determine the former. If the further education service became a local service tailored to meet local needs only, in the belief that the sum of local situations would give the right answer to national needs, we should be in a sorry state indeed. This is particularly true of higher education where, putting aside debate relating to mobility of students, there must be a national policy and a national resource plan of some sort.

What then is accountability, in the local government sense, for further education if it cannot mean complete control over the raising and spending of income?

It must surely be much more concerned with stewardship than with autonomous control of money at source. How does the local politician and the local government officer exercise accountability for a service that must have a national coherence and, in the case of higher education, must meet national criteria and, more significantly, determine its priorities over against national needs? These are questions that are, of course, crucial to local government in a number of its services and not merely in further and higher education. The 1974 reorganisation has not, of itself, given any convincing answers to these questions. For too many local politicians, accountability is the right to interfere, without involvement; it is sham consultation; it is an exercise of petty, though potent, power; it is the imposition of decisions reached in the caucus, without adequate explanation and without adequate consideration of non-local issues. For many, but too few, local politicians accountability is what it ought to be, a serious and demanding exercise in stewardship in which the onus is upon them to ensure wise and responsive leadership.

Now I have been somewhat scathing about local government, not least because I think local government is big enough to take criticism and also because I am convinced that it ought to be capable of putting its own house in order. I have been critical from the standpoint of a senior local government officer who believes in the future of local government in the further and higher education service. (I might add that one of the things that is wrong with local government is that there are many in it who would deny me the right to call myself a senior local government officer.) But criticism is not enough, there must be some constructive comment also. I will try to be constructive by returning to the three questions I posed.

I believe that it is necessary to provide a buffer, in the education service, between central government. As I see it, for such a buffer to be effective it must have within it, as an essential element, a significant element of social, democratic response. That element must not be dependent upon or directly related to the parliamentary executive. I believe that local government, for

all faults, is still the best means of providing that element, provided that it ensures the delivery of social, democratic response that is strong, energetic and, should it be necessary, capable of asserting its role over and against central government. The argument cannot be sustained that, because a service operates within a national context, every operational unit in the service must be nationally controlled. Nationally influenced and nationally responsive yes; but the operational setting of a college is local and regional and the local and regional effects of a college will be significant and far-reaching.

The task of the buffer is not to translate every issue into a local issue (that would, often enough, be looking at things through the wrong end of a municipal drainpipe, a criticism, I seem to remember, that was levelled at Neville, or was it Joseph, Chamberlain? It is to ensure that the sterling qualities of good sense, vision and independence that are in evidence in our society are brought to bear upon a service that serves that society. Moreover, those qualities must have a base within some expression of the popular will. If the buffer turns out to be nothing more than an assembly of local politicians who do not display, or acknowledge the need for, the good qualities I have mentioned, it will be useless. It is the task of local government to maintain these qualities.

It is also necessary for local government to ensure that the buffer, based upon a social democratic response, shall have full regard to the need for the professional expertise necessary in a highly professional service. That will mean a deeper and more rigorous search for good management than has yet been apparent in excursions into corporate management. It will also mean, in my view, a willingness of local government to establish its own units of professional expertise operating on a regional or national basis, to assist the larger operational units within further and higher education. Such units would not be a confession of failure of local government; they would be evidence of the success of local government in identifying the professional needs of the service.

But it is, perhaps, when we turn to accountability that we come to the most significant issues that have to be tackled, for this brings us hard against a basic consideration of political inputs, and their relationship to the management of a service. As far as elected members are concerned, and this goes too for the corporate nature of local government services, I would wish to emphasise, in relation to education, a concept of stewardship rather than accountability as such, and, in particular this behoves local government, in my view, to look to three areas of responsibility.

First is the requirement that good management requires effective delegation and there can only be effective delegation if there is a policy for a service and for an institution. Furthermore, the essence of delegation is that discretion to take action is handed over. Only by facing up the requirement that there shall be delegation can there be any definition of accountability or of stewardship. For a local authority to establish a Governing Body with responsibility for managing a College and then to take away discretion from the Governors, to have them operating in effect as an advisory committee is a denial, not only of delegation, but a sure and certain sign that the local authority, either through its elected members or chief officers or both, has no trust in its appointed managers. Elected members, if they are to exercise accountability and stewardship in matters of policy must learn to delegate responsibility for management decisions. The mature authority and the wise chief officer have learned this lesson. It is a lesson that has to be taught and learned over and over again.

Secondly, is the requirement that the client shall be central to considerations relating to the provision of the service. It is perhaps because this is such an obvious statement that it has to be insisted upon, for there is no doubt that it is repeatedly ignored. Who is the client or, more to the point, who are the clients, for there will never be one source only? The student is a client, so are employers and professional bodies, so are training boards; so, also, under certain circumstances is the employee of the College. Now a client relationship is a professional relationship operative within a social context. The paternalism, or the arrogance, of

"we know best" on the part of elected members must not [illegible] that relationship; neither must the spurious claims to wi[illegible], based upon a majority of 20 votes in a ward election w[illegible] 30% poll. The stewardship exercised by local government must be such as to foster the client relationship and to respond to it.

Thirdly, it has to be accepted that whilst expediency will be necessary, it is no substitute for policy. Accountability, or stewardship, whichever is preferred, demands that elected members shall state clearly what policies are being implemented within the limits of discretion allowed the authority and requires that there shall be monitoring of the implementation of that policy. Usually, it is not those who are responsible for the management of colleges who do not face up to the implications, financial and otherwise, of policy implementation; it is elected members, who, all too often, are hedging their bets, politically.

I commenced this paper by posing the question: "Do the local authorities have the will to continue in education?" I am not at all sure what the answer to that question will be. I am persuaded, however, that if the will falters, then further and higher education will be the worse off and local government will have weakened itself immeasurably, to the detriment of our society.

Response by Professor Meredydd Hughes, Professor of Education (Social and Administrative Studies) University of Birmingham.

In this paper I see Canon Tolley as a true believer in the Local Authority connection, occasionally sorely assailed by twinges of disbelief. He makes a restrained reference to evidence of an impatience with those who have resisted roughshod treatment and disregard of necessary qualities and freedoms, but it is more in sorrow than in anger that he speaks.

In seeking to justify the LEA connection it is interesting that Canon Tolley considers firstly the nature and level of expertise which the LEA can make available, rather than the contribution of the elected

members. At a general level he finds LEA professional expertise unimpressive in relation to teacher education, in meeting the needs of industry (hence the Training Services Agency) and in assessing the cost effectiveness of institutions. At the institutional level he questions the adequacy of the professional advice and guidance which the LEA can make available to the larger institutions, and concludes that corporate management has not made things any better. Canon Tolley's faith in the LEA connection is clearly here under some strain.

The theme of accountability is a familiar one in BEAS conferences, and rightly so because the kind of accountability which is required of the education service is a major determinant of its quality. In turning to this issue, Canon Tolley rightly notes that the pure Layfield doctrine that the control of the raising and spending of income should go together cannot be rigorously applied to LEA involvement in further and higher education. He puts forward the concept of stewardship. A steward according to the Concise Oxford Dictionary is a "person entrusted with the management of another's property". On behalf of whom is this 'serious and demanding exercise in stewardship' to be performed? Presumably ultimately on behalf of the general public, but in that case I am not sure that one is saying anything that is not already implied in the original word 'accountability' in that all public offices can surely be regarded as exercises in stewardship. Whether we are talking of accountability or stewardship, Canon Tolley finds that the concept and practice of many local politicians is inadequate.

The paper proceeds to provide a far from convincing affirmation of faith in the role of local government in further and higher education. "I believe that local government" the speaker says, "for all its faults, is still the best means of providing that element (i.e. of social democratic response) provided that ....." and then come all the inevitable reservations. Not surprisingly therefore the paper ends on a highly prescriptive note, telling us what must be done, including the interesting suggestion of support to FE administration by local government units of professional expertise operating on a regional or national basis. I am disappointed

however that I can find no attempt at a realistic assessment of whether the various admirable things which the speaker says must be done, are in fact likely to be done - not in a few enlightened authorities but in the vast majority.

Looking at the paper as a whole, it seems to me that Canon Tolley has, no doubt deliberately, left a great deal unsaid. In particular he has chosen not to discuss possible changes in structural arrangements, and one would hardly have gathered from reading the paper that there has been a continuing debate since the mid-sixties about the control of further and higher education. Let me remind you of the more recent developments.

In 1972 the Layfield Select Committee on Expenditure recommended - though the case was not accepted by the government of the day - that all higher education should come under central control, administered by an independent commission on the lines of UGC. Three main arguments were deployed:

1. That the present system leads to ineffective use of resources, uneven standards of provision and inadequate co-operation.

2. That higher education should be centrally administered because it is a national rather than a local service.

3. That the present pooling system provides little incentive to limit total expenditure - though it may be noted that the DES Chairman of the Pooling Committee said in his oral evidence to the Layfield Committee that in practice maintaining authorities have effectively carried out their collective responsibilities, their stewardship to use Canon Tolley's word, on behalf of all the LEAs.

The Layfield Committee itself, did not like pooling arrangements but considered that there would be greater objection in a system of specific grants because of the possibility of more detailed central control. The Committee, it will be remembered, wished to retain local authority control but wanted a revision of the method of sharing the cost of local-authority-administered higher education.

Now the whole issue is being considered by the Oakes Committee on the Management of the Maintained Sector of Higher Education. It is of interest to notice that evidence presented both to the Layfield and Oakes Committees from the academic staff and the administrative staff of the institutions themselves favours the introduction of national administration modelled on the UGC.

While we await the Oakes Report, it may be noted that Mr. John Horrell, the Chairman of CLEA has denied speculation that local authorities might be about to lose responsibility for polytechnics and colleges of higher education. At the same time it is widely predicted that there will be specific grants for 75 to 80 per cent of total expenditure dispensed by a new higher education grants committee, the remaining 20-25 per cent falling on the rates of the maintaining authorities. If this comes about, I believe it is to be welcomed. It seems to me to provide the structural framework for the new attitudes in local government towards further and higher education to blossom for which Dr. Tolley appeals.

There are also interesting further possibilities. The proposed higher education grants committee, while involving the participation of the Local Authorities, will inevitably be concerned with broader issues than those dealt with by the Pooling Committee. It will analyse supply and demand in the maintained sector and will advise the Secretary of State on policy. It will allocate funds for running costs and control capital expenditure. Inevitably it will develop a working relationship with the University Grants Committee, which may become closer with time. It may be another straw in the wind that the Government is also setting up a trans-binary working party to examine the feasibility of a national information centre for credit transfer in further and higher education.

If all this results in a gradual blurring of the binary line separating the universities and higher education institutions in the so-called public sector, as recently predicted by Professor Kogan and others, it will in my view be no bad thing.

REFERENCES

1. OECD, Educational Development Strategy in England and Wales, Paris, 1975.

2. The Layfield Report, Local Government Finance, Appendix 1: Evidence by Government Departments, HMSO, 1976, p.37.

3. T. Becher, J. Embling and M. Kogan, 'Purposes, Policies and Prospects', unpublished report quoted in THES, 9.9.77.

Response by Harry Gray, Principal Lecturer,
Anglian Regional Management Centre, Romford, Essex.

I agree largely with what George Tolley has said, though I would express myself somewhat differently. I am still a little puzzled by the conference topic because it does not seem to be a very real question, unless we are to discuss whether education should be in the private sector - that is, entirely in the market place. I should be happy to make out a case for that without necessarily accepting it, but there is no end of possible alternative structures upon which we might speculate. The reality is that education in this country has both national and local aspects, and there always will be some form of local administration and control (though they are not necessarily the same thing) even if the concept of local be widened to mean regional or provincial.

In my view, Dr. Tolley rightly interprets the issue as the conflict or coincidence of interest between national and local administration. We can only speak in generalities about the effectiveness of local or national administration because both scenes are replete with variation; in some cases local authorities are good, in others bad, and some national agencies are good and some are bad. The question is one of checks and balance, holding the tensions between extremes so that a creative response occurs. We are also concerned with the identification of long term and overall needs and strategies and short term and local interests - nowhere better illustrated, as we have been shown, than in the training and supply of teachers.

How one gets the balance right I do not know, though like everyone else I am quite clear when we get it wrong - or rather when someone else gets it wrong. However, I would like to boast that I had different views about both local government reorganisation, and the reorganisation of the National Health service, both of which in my view were bad solutions because they were compromises, and leant too heavily on the opinion of consultants with a vested interest in certain forms of organisation. My own view as an opinionated expert is that in any form of organisation we need as great a distance as possible between represented extremes if checks and balance are to function effectively.

Having said that, I should like to make a further point and that is to urge that we do not put our faith in administrative solutions. It is the easiest thing in the world to dream up a logical administrative system but such dreams never relate to reality nor can they be expected to. All the administrative schemes I have ever read assume that people are ciphers and predictable in their behaviour and will do what they ought to do. Corporate management is a case in point because people never behave corporately. Rather than dream up new schemes we should try harder to improve the ones we have.

If we are to do this, then we must deal with the issues that cause the difficulties, and I perceive these as centring on the question of power. In governmental terms power has to do with money - in the fiscal pyramid, power increases the farther away from the source of revenue raising one is. National government will always be more powerful than local government in this way. On the other hand, accountability (at least in the short term) works in the reverse direction - the nearer to the source of revenue raising the more vulnerable one is to taxpayer's influence. Hence we have the need for checks and balances between the most local interests and national concern. That is why local authorities continued to build colleges of education in a period of declining school enrolments: local pressures were greater than national needs. The English and Welsh local education authority seems to have the advantage of distance from the electorate that the American school

boards lack.

But the really big problem of administration lies in the quality of the people who work the system. This is a very difficult problem because there are cultural differences between local and national civil services. Corruption and deliberate bias apart, how can there be ensured a fair distribution of honest men in significant positions in the system to guarantee the best interests of the greatest number? I am afraid I do not know the answer although it has much to do with what Dr. Tolley calls a sense of stewardship. Those who are employed in the administrative system should feel themselves to be working in a situation of optimum freedom, optimum support and optimum accountability. By this I mean that we should give as much freedom to our colleagues as we can give and they can take, we should support them only as much as they need and as little as we can bring ourselves to do; and that we should always consider our responsibility to others as well as to ourselves.

This brings me to my last point. Education exists to serve the needs of a number of groups of people - teachers, politicians, career administrators in local and national government, employers and parents and students who are perhaps the primary clients. Unhappily the primary client in education is still the most neglected member in the system. The answer to the question of 'in or out' has to do with the extent education can be organised to deal adequately with the needs of the client. I think it is highly significant that a new agency has entered the field of education - the Manpower Services Agency. As with the question of teacher training and supply what have both local and national government been doing that failed to recognise the employment needs of education?

Finally, I must raise the idea that the problems of education have not a great deal to do with the actual forms of administration - local or national, private or public - but rather with the problems of institutionalisation. The de-schoolers have overstated their case but I think the case still needs careful consideration. Institutions tend to satisfy the needs of administration and not satisfy

the needs of non-administrative members. As one who teaches in a very large institution I am very much aware of the horrific costs, financial and emotional, of organisation which seems to have very little to do with student learning. We need to discover and experiment with other ways of organising education around student needs and not the convenience of chairmen of governors, directors, vice-chancellors, principals, heads of department, deans of faculties, co-ordinators of courses, heads of division, etc. etc. - are there any autonomous teachers left in Higher and Further education apart from the part timers? We need to look a great deal more closely at the need for concurrent and recurrent education, non-vocational education for adults and vocational retraining for everyone in middle age and mid career. Quite frankly I do not know whether local or national administration will be better able to deal with the new questions of education and I rather suspect that it does not matter. I do believe that there is an issue in our preoccupation with the ideas of management and administration, at the expense of the primary task of the organisation of teaching. The challenge to the BEAS in all this is that we should not obscure the issues by debating irrelevant ideas and obscuring the real needs of teaching which needs to be managed more and administered less.

THE SCHOOL'S POSITION IN RELATION TO THE "GREAT DEBATE" ON EDUCATION

Robert Spooner,
Headmaster, Foxwood School, Leeds.

There have been in the last twenty years at least five major developments affecting education, all of which have involved schools in substantial stress and strain.

1. There has been an enormous growth in the teacher force made necessary by an increased number of children, the raising of the school-leaving age, the growth of sixth forms and some modest improvement in staffing standards. From some 179,000 teachers in 1945 the numbers have risen to some 459,000 today. (There were roughly 300,000 in 1966 so in the last ten years the growth has been phenomenal.) As nothing was done in these growth years to make teaching a more attractive profession one would expect some 'dilution' to have taken place as students were admitted to Colleges, which were permitted only a low failure rate, with minimal qualifications.

2. Included in the increased number of children were many who came from the 'new commonwealth', all of whom were entitled to special consideration because of their different cultural background and many who had linguistic difficulties.

3. Nearly all local authorities have in this period undertaken reorganisation programmes involving revolutionary changes in the composition of their schools. The virtual abolition of the 11+ and the establishment of Comprehensive patterns of education, together with, in a number of areas the introduction of a three-tier system, and in others sixth-form or tertiary colleges, has required of teachers generally a resilience and capacity for change not demanded of members of other professions. The concept of loyalty to a school has been destroyed as schools have been amalgamated and

restructured, and experienced teachers have been obliged, in some cases in the closing years of service, to face teaching situations wholly new to them and for which they were totally unfitted.

4. The school leaving age has been raised and not only has the curriculum required restructuring but attitudes have had to be modified to meet the needs of an increased percentage of students who see themselves as adult. The challenge has in some measure been sharpened by changing social attitudes.

5. The reorganisation of Local Government in 1974, undertaken with total disregard for the education service has in some cases been followed by malign doctrines of corporate management, which have proved in effect demoralising and harmful to schools.

Unworthy a document though it is in many respects, when the Green Paper states "it is simply untrue that there has been a general decline in educational standards ..... to-day's school children read better than those of thirty years ago ..... more take, and pass public examinations ..... many more go on to higher education" one realises, not just how remarkable the achievement of the school has been, but what a churlish, ill-considered and harmful speech the Prime Minister made in Oxford when he used the prestige of his office effectively to denigrate this achievement. (If after Trafalgar the Prime Minister of the day had called for a public debate about the competence of the navy because some doubted whether the victory had been sufficiently complete, he would have been lynched.) Teaching Unions are cautious organisations, always fighting the next battle, and they gave him a somewhat muted response, but I have no doubt personally that those who had worked hardest to make some success of this period of change resented his remarks bitterly. They looked at least for their cause to be championed by the Minister of Education; but in vain. She pleaded ignorance, hoped to learn from the "Great Debate", and in a series of fatuous statements has echoed her master and, in spite of some routine placatory comments, has by her broad stance given comfort to the enemies of the education service. Even

though the Great Debate turned out to be a great flop, it enabled certain vocal elements to voice their belief that there has been a decline in educational standards. It is not surprising that there are many who hold this belief. They are to be found amongst:-

a. Industrialists - mainly because they are attracting a less able work-force owing to the vastly increased number of pupils involved in higher education and the increased percentage of more attractive jobs to be found outside industry. The change to modern maths teaching, which has made the traditional 'tests' many firms insist on giving wholly inappropriate has stopped.

b. Political opponents of Comprehensive education desperate to be proved right.

c. Teachers whose experience has hitherto been confined to selective pupils, who can't gear their work to the needs of the whole ability range and resent the need to attempt to meet challenges they have never before known.

d. Members of the public who cannot adjust to social change and blame the schools for the emergence of the 'permissive society'.

e. A substantial percentage of Her Majesty's Inspectorate who themselves cannot come to terms with change, resent their loss of power, and who want to see education preserved as an elitist service for the most able, with the remainder disciplined and given vocational training.

It is a source of dismay to those teachers who believe that comprehensive policies are succeeding, and most teachers working in Comprehensive schools do think this, to find a Minister, who still advocates this policy, apparently so much influenced by these people.

If one turns to the "Green Paper" one finds that it sets out eight aims for schools. These are:-

1. To help children develop lively, enquiring minds; giving them the ability to question and to argue rationally, and to apply themselves to tasks.
2. To instil respect for moral values, for other people and for oneself, and tolerance of other races, religions, and ways of life.
3. To help children understand the world in which we live, and the interdependence of nations.
4. To help children to use language effectively and imaginatively in reading, writing and speaking.
5. To help children to appreciate how the nation earns and maintains its standard of living and properly to esteem the role of industry and commerce in this process.
6. To provide a basis of mathematical, scientific and technical knowledge, enabling boys and girls to learn the essential skills needed in a fast-changing world of work.
7. To teach children about human achievement and aspirations in the arts and sciences, in religion, and in the search for a more just social order.
8. To encourage and foster the development of the children whose social or environmental disadvantages cripple their capacity to learn, if necessary by making additional resources available to them.

From none of these aims would one readily dissent, though they compete with one another for time and resources, and the way number five is expressed is so clearly designed to soothe the Prime Minister's 'amour propre' as to appear comic. I am, however, glad it is there for it illustrates a nice point about the so-called over-loading of the curriculum. Oddly enough in the last ten years more time than ever before has been spent on activities that have this aim in mind. The big growth areas have been in Community studies, (catering also for aim 3), economics, social and economic history, commerce (and sometimes accounts), statistics, computerised maths, and in particular on careers advice (making pupils aware of the big variety of jobs that aren't available), works visits, work experience, taster courses in further education, and actually in promoting courses with vocational content such as

Home Management (with plastering, plumbing, electrical wiring and bricklaying elements), Engineering and Workshop practice, and Motoring Science. This has been possible only by taking time from other sections of the curriculum.

But one could take these points one at a time and show how well schools have responded to these enlarged aims, how time-consuming they are, and how remote in spirit from those people who are arguing for a return to the "3Rs". Number 4, for instance, emphasizes, in the use of the word 'Imaginatively' (and the absence of the word 'accurately') together with the inclusion of 'speaking', the difference between the teacher who devotes his time to spelling, grammar and punctuation, and the vast majority who nowadays, while having some regard for these skills, do not allow an undue emphasis on them to inhibit the development of the imagination or limit the confidence of those who need encouragement and support if they are to contrive to speak effectively in public.

Number 6 is of interest also because it has been in pursuit of this aim that Modern Maths teaching has been developed. It has sought to help students understand basic theory and equip them for a rapidly changing world, rather than expect them to learn by rote the mechanical skills that they can purchase with a £5 calculator.

But it has been the pursuit of aims 1 and 2 which has obliged secondary schools to abandon, whenever they can, authoritarian and coercive methods and base their techniques increasingly on mutual respect between teacher and student and a code of self-discipline. The most beneficial change that has taken place in the best Comprehensive schools is that they are now true communities, welcoming a dialogue with parents and involving all staff, teaching and non-teaching, and when practicable students, in decision making. Although complex institutions they have proved their capacity to adjust their policies to changed conditions and a changing world. They have been able to do this because they have been virtually autonomous, their staffs have responded to the trust placed in them, they have been party to decision making, particularly where it affected their area of expertise, and because of

this they have been able to establish broad policies and a generally accepted ethos while remaining pragmatic in nature, not hide-bound by preconceived views and not at the mercy of an eccentric and authoritarian head. Though there is much in the Green Paper to applaud, the encouraging parts are contradicted by elements which threaten the whole atmosphere and basis on which schools at present operate. To detail them all would be wearisome, but by commenting on three of them I hope I can successfully illustrate this danger.

1. The Taylor Committee's recommendations on Governing bodies

If what has been reported of these proposals is accurate the bulk of the governing bodies will be drawn from the staff of the schools, the parents and the community, instead of from the Councillors on the Education Committee. The Governors will have authoritarian powers involving the curriculum and the detailed policies of the school will be subject to their review. Instead of the Head in conjunction with his staff being within a broad professional framework autonomous, power will be removed from them and placed in the hands of a lay committee, many of them with their own particular and personal interest in the decisions to be made. One wonders what doctors, or solicitors or bank managers might make of similar proposals to control their judgements.

2. Standards and Assessment

The Green Paper includes the following paragraph:

> "Growing recognition of the need for schools to demonstrate their accountability to the society which they serve requires a coherent and soundly based means of assessment for the educational system as a whole, for schools and for individual pupils."

The whole section deals with HMI's, the local inspectorate, examinations, character 'profiles', diagnostic testing and record keeping. It belongs quite clearly to the world of abrasive management techniques. Carried to any significant conclusion it would

involve an enormous drain on resources.

3. Inefficient teachers

The Green Paper discusses the need to establish standard procedures for the assessment of teacher's performance ... and warning to teachers whose performance is consistently unsatisfactory. The last point quite proper one might think, but one might also expect to cost the price of the operation. Taken together these proposals represent a clear vote of 'no confidence' in schools as they function at the moment and one must assume that the most naive Minister will have recognised this and calculated that the issues are so important that the gains to be achieved will outweigh the hurt inflicted and the loss of morale that must ensue. If I thought there were any gains from these proposals I might be tempted to concur. One of the characteristics of most teachers is that however well they do, they are always anxious to do better. Unhappily I find all three proposals incalculably harmful.

The advantage of the present system of Governing bodies is that they represent a voice for the school with the authority. On the whole they leave professional judgements to professional people. Their meetings serve to alert the Councillors who sit on the Governing bodies to the effect of the Committee's policy on the school. They are broadly helpful and outward looking. They appear to usurp the 'authoritarian Head's' role just as it is disappearing. They may not consist of 'professional politicians' but their activities will undoubtedly be political. The parents will see the school through the eyes of their offspring and will basically support their own child's interest as they conceive it. The community representatives will certainly have their own particular axes to grind. One may expect the Governor's meetings to become a battle-ground. At worst the Governors will dictate what happens and use coercive powers to enforce their will. At best the energies of the staff will be deployed on a grand scale just to earn the privilege, which they enjoy at the moment, of teaching as they think best, and even then their confidence will be undermined. Influence will increasingly go to those who can string together a

few glib and high sounding phrases. Cant is already the bane of the education service; it bids fair to become its hall-mark. Furthermore, if the Governors really are going to dictate policy in schools, then decision making will be removed a long way away from those who carry it out - a process that is all too common nowadays and the cause of much national frustration.

I turn now to assessment. This is, of course, a growth industry. If schools are to be assessed rigorously on their end products, they will find it necessary to make the most detailed assessment possible of the standards and potential of their intake. The 11+ will pale into insignificance, for added to the IQ, the AQ and the EQ will be character profiles, an analysis of parental backgrounds and attitude, diagnostic tests, assessments of social problems and moral standards, not in order to provide appropriate teaching, but as an ultimate alibi. If as some members of the Taylor committee would like, these have to be shown to the parents, the cost to the education service of the libel suits that will ensue will be formidable indeed. Apart from the actual time spent on such tests and the labour involved in compiling the results, the resultant concentration of energy on those things that can be assessed will be horrible to see. As all the really valuable aspects of education, the invaluable bits, can't be evaluated, and lie in the area of the imponderable, they will be consequently neglected.

Professionally all teachers are of course equal; some, one must accept, are more equal than others. Generally speaking all teachers have strengths and weaknesses. A sensible Head will look for the good in his staff and see that they have full scope to use their qualities. He will help them to avoid exposing their weaknesses. If we are to move into an abrasive era in which Heads are expected to 'weed out' bad teachers, he will have, to prove his case, to expose them fully. He must constantly remind them of their faults and see that they are asked to perform those tasks they are least good at. Instead of looking for success and encouraging it he will need to nag and reprove and emphasize failure. Nor can he reasonably treat one or two of his staff in this way and adopt a different attitude to the rest. The price of getting rid of his least

successful teacher will be to curb the enthusiasm and diminish the sense of well-being of his whole teacher force. And when they are eliminated what will happen to them? The Green paper suggests they might be found "some other post within the authority's service". In the education service perhaps? As embryo Chief Officers? As advisers? As lecturers on Management courses? Why trouble to make overt a process that for years has been tacit?

My main concern is that as a result of these 'innovations' the basic rules for the civilised management of professional staff will be overturned. These are:-

1. To involve in policy and decision making those who have to carry out the policy and as far as detail is concerned give scope for judgement to the person actually doing the job.
2. To treat staff as professional people relying fundamentally on their own standards, self-criticism and devotion to duty and refraining from nagging them about their peccadilloes.
3. To recognise that everyone has strengths and weaknesses and to discriminate sufficiently to exploit strengths and to avoid placing teachers in situations where their weaknesses are apparent to all.
4. To respect different views, diversity of approach and personal idiosyncracy, recognising that these things add to the richness of living.
5. To create a relaxed atmosphere in which teachers willingly make voluntary contributions to school-life which are well above the call of duty.
6. To spend the maximum amount of time and energy on teaching and learning and to avoid in-fighting, intrigue, introspection and fruitless assessment.

I would have more respect for the Green Paper if at any time there was an attempt in it to price its policies or to show where the choices need to be made. Even in a basic section such as the one on the School Curriculum it is content with an elementary analysis of the situation as it exists without attempting to show how one policy conflicts with another. It applauds schools for their attempt

to provide suitable fare for the non-academic child obliged to stay on at school until the age of sixteen. It nowhere states that the mainspring of this success has been to concentrate on each individual's area of success and cease to subject him to those activities in which he demonstrably fails. This has involved offering a very varied programme and giving freedom of choice. It is an inescapable fact that the more one insists on an enlarged common core, the more one abandons this policy. I looked in vain for some understanding that important though Maths may be, it is not so important that one should exalt it to the point that those who can't succeed with this subject are made to feel worthless.

Indeed one of the main indictments of the Green paper is that it is toneless. It fails to discriminate between the importance of each sentiment and show where they are in conflict. Indeed here and elsewhere the Minister appears to deal with ideas the way a nymphomaniac deals with men. Anyone will do for the time-being, but they must be played with one at a time. If a permanent liaison is to be formed many of them will need to be discarded. Another, and perhaps more serious indictment is that the Green paper fails to deal in any lucid and constructive way with the main issues that face the education service at the moment. These are:-

1. Whether the benefits of Comprehensive Education and the raising of the school-leaving age will be realised by the broadening of Sixth form education so that the 'new' sixth-former in the 'open' sixth form will be truly able to develop his 'talents and abilities'. If this is to happen the Minister must recognise CEE, campaign enthusiastically for its development and do her best to see that it has vocational value and includes vocational as well as 'educational' content. She needs to make up her mind about the 16+ and encourage those determined to make it successful. She needs to stop implying that the country can't afford expanding six-forms and see that the money being spent on vain 'job-creation' projects goes to them. She needs to make sure that it is at least as attractive financially to stay on at school as be out of work.

2. Whether the decline in school population and the surplus teacher force will be used to reduce class size and honour pledges that have been long on the record to this effect. If a positive answer is not given to this question then assumptions will be drawn to the contrary. The Minister should realise that the present policy of increasing the number of advisers and inspectors, devoting resources to greatly expanding in-service training, diverting energy and resources and manpower to 'assessment' proposals must be seen as a failure to get priorities right in this respect.

3. Whether the determination to offer equal educational opportunity, repeated in the Green paper is at all serious. If it is, something more convincing under this head than the sparse paragraph that appears there is called for. Authorities ought at least to be advised how to calculate capitation to achieve this end and some constructive suggestions should be made to schools on how to deploy resources to achieve this effect. A policy to absorb all fee-paying schools into the state system is called for if this statement is to avoid being read as hypocritical.

4. Whether the distinctive role of education in local government is to be preserved and strengthened or whether it will be further eroded by corporate management and Whitehall interference.

5. Whether schools will be encouraged to experiment with their fourth and fifth form courses in the interest of those pupils whose best interest is not served by watered-down academic curricula, and whether more money will be provided to this effect.

Until the Minister began flirting with other issues some positive lead on these five points most schools would have found satisfactory. Now, if she is to obtain the full understanding and support of the teaching profession she concedes is necessary, she needs to:-

a. onfirm the reasonable autonomy of schools over what is taught, provided they continue to be responsive to the views

of parents and pupils and keep in mind the need for employment.

b. State explicitly that the inspectorate will continue to be used fundamentally in an advisory capacity.
c. Reject the imposition of abrasive management techniques and plump for encouragement, support and understanding.
d. Ensure that those schools that have been drastically reconstructed have time to settle down.

The declining birth-rate should be seen as a wonderful opportunity to provide adequate resources for schools for the first time ever. Their position is that they deserve and need them.

REFERENCES

Education in Schools: A Consultative Document (The Green Paper), HMSO, 1977.

A New Partnership for Our Schools (The Taylor Report), HMSO, 1977.

Response by John Sayer, Principal, Banbury School, Oxon.

Robert Spooner's exposure of the Green Paper, and especially of its omissions, will command general sympathy. So devastating a demolition is bound to provoke some disagreement, and I for one would not wish to diminish the Secretary of State's concern to find a little time for in-service training and staff development. Moreover, whilst agreeing with most of the strictures, I would still doubt whether the Green Paper itself has done much harm.

The exercise itself was a sign of frustration in central government, and this will continue. Some of us may have preferred to hear Fred Mulley whimpering that the only powers he had to direct funds for specific purposes were for the removal of derelict air-raid shelters from school premises. Those of us who have heard

Timothy Raison preparing himself for office recently, will notice that he too has been reading into the 1944 Act an intention of genuine influence from Her Majesty's Government, and I believe the right approach now is to determine what that influence should properly be, and not whether it should exist. Indeed, as we witness the Government able to direct its energies and policies directly through the Manpower Services Commission, which has executive power, rather than through the DES, which has so little, we should be asking ourselves whether we would prefer to see major sectors of what we might consider to be the education service removed from our professional security altogether.

It is embarrassing to find myself in total disagreement with Robert Spooner's remarks on the Taylor Committee: embarrassing because we clearly want the same good things for our schools as schools, and because I see the spirit of the Taylor Report to be necessary if we are to obtain them. We would all want to restore "the concept of loyalty to a school", and to "confirm the reasonable autonomy of schools over what is taught, provided they continue to be responsive to the views of parents and pupils and keep in mind the need for employment". A Governing Body composed of a balance of parents, perhaps pupils, teachers, and those from the local world of work, with county council representatives to the one school and not pretending to govern a fistful, would appear to reflect the same wish. The powers which Taylor would give to Governors do not seem to me to differ greatly from what in theory they already are, except that the local authority would be required to give due consideration to the views of Governors, which at the moment can be swept aside. All that prevents Governors now from exercising "authoritarian powers involving the curriculum and the detailed policies of the School" is a fund of commonsense and mutual respect, and this would continue to be so.

Our difference is, I suspect, that Robert Spooner would like to see Governors drawn from an education committee composed of councillors able to put education before party group, with education officers untrammelled by "malign corporate management", in a local authority capable of carrying out its legal duty to maintain

an education service, and leaving professional people to get on with the job, whereas I have come to hold the view that local government reorganisation in 1974 was misconceived and a wasted opportunity; that the time has come to evaluate its effects; that the political parties have now hardened in their determination to polarise local issues and especially education; that this has spread to the composition of governing bodies and has replaced regard for the school as such; that corporate management has indeed been wrongly applied, but partly because local authorities are wrongly constituted to begin with; that it has had the effect of divorcing the schools, and to some extent advisers from officers, who have become, in order of priority in their daily lives, firstly the lackeys to the majority party group, secondly the members with most to concede of a corporate management team, thirdly the employer's representative in negotiation with teachers' unions, and only fourthly able to retain any real contact with what schools are all about. Ron Glatter gave a gentle warning of this when responding to Professor Stewart's hymn to corporate management in this Society's Journal three years ago; it has happened, and has reached the point of no return.

The Maud Report was greatly influenced by two considerations: centres of interest, and the size of a local unit able to maintain an education service. The first was mauled by party bargaining, the second envisaged maintenance of an education service only in terms of advisory support. We need for our schools a much more local response to professional skills than the new local authorities can represent; and we need for our professional skills a much more embracing authority. As a solution to the present mis-match between central and local government, I would wish us to investigate an education service vested in regional authorities, able to command the whole cycle of management, including the training and development of teachers, advice and expertise in all aspects of school and college management, the relation of educational planning to regional planning of the economy, the assessment and evaluation of schools, and, if we have to put up with them, regional examination boards for pupils too. Local rates and central government funds would both be passed to this regional authority

for the maintenance of an education service. Nearer to each school or college, the local community would have restored to it what district and parish councils have lost, powers of government in each institution, much along the lines recommended in the Taylor Report.

The regional dimension would only make sense if the Government wanted it to work, and it has shown in its muted and delayed publication: Devolution to the Regions, The English Dimension, that it does not wish to encourage this direction of thought. Perhaps this makes it all the more attractive. The Association of County Councils is similarly defensive. But without it, corporate management in any planning sense will simply not happen. We have regional economic planning councils, training service agency regions, regional advisory councils for further education, incipient regional committees for the supply and training of teachers, regional examining bodies across part of the school system, regional educational broadcasting, regional associations for the Arts, and for Sports Council, regional health authorities, regions for Her Majesty's Inspectorate, regions for the Understanding British Industry project, and increasingly an extension of regional planning from the European Communities. What an opportunity for Government to wed education to the wider aspects of planning, and to bring together the fragmented pieces of what should be an education service but is at present a shambles. It is just possible that in the process we might re-vivify both a genuinely local sense of communal responsibility and a concern for the government of our country.

Into this pattern of regional bodies I would wish to see fitted two professional concerns which emerged from Robert Spooner's paper. Firstly, the whole business of evaluation and assessment. I am one who questions the effects of being the most examined school population in Europe at age 16, and certainly do not want added to this appalling waste of energy an additional battery of tests which will tell us in ten years time what we have to correct this year. If regional bodies were able to train teachers to assess accurately, as part of the business of teaching, I would wish to

see modes of assessment appropriate to the curricular objectives of each school, be it initial assessment, or in the course of a pattern of education, or, if it has to continue, terminal assessment. The examination business would be harnessed to equip schools for this purpose, and not continue to exist as an overlay. Secondly, I would wish to see the teaching profession as such organise at long last a Teachers' General Council, on a federal structure based on each region, firmly in control of professional standards, and in a position to play its proper part in regional planning of all aspects of the education service. This I believe to be the proper response to Robert Spooner's urgent demand for recognition of the professionalism of teachers.

Response by Patrick Bailey, Senior Lecturer, School of Education, University of Leicester.

In education as in every other important human activity, the really important questions are those of purpose. In this case, the primary questions, which have to be addressed to the schools and to the teaching profession, are these: what is the precise nature of your special contribution to society? In other words, in what sense are you experts? And, what are the most important tasks which need to be done at this time, which you alone can do? If these two questions can be answered, then it becomes possible to enquire what kinds of organisation, what structural relationships between central government, local government and the schools are most likely to assist schools and teachers to make their special contributions effectively?

A BASIC PRINCIPLE OF ORGANISATION

As to the principles upon which the further development of the educational service should be based, I would suggest that the most important is this: that the responsibilities, tasks and resources assigned to each level, from the teacher in the classroom to central government, should be those which produce the best educational return when applied at that level. In other words, if a

certain job can be done most effectively (which often means quickly) by the teacher, he should be expected to do it. If another job can best be done by the local authority, perhaps because it involves the adaptation of national regulations to local conditions, then the authority should be allowed to do it.

The principle, that responsibilities, tasks and resources should be assigned to appropriate levels, is a simple one; yet its application is extremely difficult and involves political decisions. The difficulty of applying the principle is no reason for abandoning it as a basis of thought and action.

One reason for the difficulty is that educational returns are hard to define, compared, say with short-term economic or political returns. Lacking this clear definition of what it is education produces, it is difficult to get agreement, at any level, to make the achievement of an educational return the prime objective of policy. One important task now facing the teaching profession is to define the nature of an educational 'return' or 'product' more precisely than hitherto. If this is not done, then economic, political and other forms of 'return' will always take precedence with politicians over education. I would suggest that, in this search for definitions of a worthwhile educational product, one looks principally at the schools and other teaching institutions, not at the intricacies of educational administration.

There are signs at present that decisions are tending to reduce the range of responsibilities and therefore the autonomy accorded to schools. Teachers may legitimately resist this tendency only by establishing their claim to provide a public service which is clearly defined and important and to possess a unique professional expertise. If this claim is to be substantiated, then there has to be a determined, systematic development of what Eric Hoyle terms an 'extended professionalism' from within the teaching profession itself. There are clear signs that this is taking place.

TWO KEY TASKS

Following from Robert Spooner's remarks, though not fully agreeing with them, I would suggest that two other particularly important tasks now face the educational service and the teaching profession in particular. The first of these is to find ways of engaging parents and local communities more effectively in support of the schools.

It is clear that, in many cases, schools have done all that they possibly can to persuade pupils to take up the educational opportunities offered. Only greater parental support could conceivably produce a significant improvement. The achieving of this increased support is partly a matter of administrative structure. It would appear to require some modest changes in the government and management of schools to produce a more explicit parental responsibility and more specific community involvement in school affairs. Support will never be obtained, in dealing with difficult pupils, for instance, while parents perceive a school as a remote institution, over which they have little more control than they have over the army. The only hope of success (and in many cases it is a slight one) is surely to make education more structurally local, more responsive to local needs. Given political skill, such developments need not result in ill-advised meddling in the minutiae of school affairs, nor in governing bodies becoming battlegrounds.

The second task for all who are concerned with teaching is to seek, actively, a genuine, undefensive and informed debate about the school curriculum with all the interested parties, at local and national level. Education is far too important and too expensive to be left entirely to teachers. The teaching profession and the educational service generally have now to demonstrate that they can join on equal terms in a debate about education with industrialists, civil servants and politicians from the only position of strength available to them, that of a clearly thought out professional expertise.

ADMINISTRATION

Geoffrey Winter,
Principal Lecturer in Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, formerly Chief Education Officer, North Riding.

The theme of the conference is set in the context of the situation following local government reorganisation in April 1974. The question which it poses, which is whether the education service should continue to be administered through the present system of local government, is not one which had any significant currency twenty, ten or even five years ago. It has come to be asked rather more often within the last year or two, that is to say in the period following the biggest change in local government since 1944, a change which presumably included among its aims the enhancement of the ability of local government to provide effectively those functions allocated to it. Why should there now be the questioning of the location of education in local government as currently constituted?

What changes did the 1972 Local Government Act make to the structure of the education system?

It abolished all local education authorities in England and Wales outside Greater London; these authorities were the councils of counties and of county boroughs which under the 1944 Education Act had been the local education authorities. It abolished Divisional Executives and Excepted Districts. It created metropolitan counties and metropolitan districts, non-metropolitan counties and districts, and designated the councils of metropolitan districts and of non-metropolitan counties as the local education authorities, the successors to the county borough and county councils.

Despite opposition, but with the considerable support of the National Union of Teachers and of the Association of Education Committees, those provisions of the 1944 Act which required the establishment

of Education Committees and the appointment of chief education officers were retained.

Other legislation affected education. The National Health Service Re-Organisation Act of 1973 removed the duty of local education authorities to provide a school health service whilst the Employment and Training Act of 1973 placed on local education authorities the duty to provide a careers service.

The reorganisation reduced the number of local education authorities outside Greater London to eighty-three - forty-seven non-metropolitan counties covering about 60% of the total population of England and Wales and thirty-six metropolitan districts covering about 23%. It did not create local education authorities of approximately equal size - the populations of the new local education authorities range from about 100,000 to about 1,500,000. It did not create the unitary authorities which many local government officers had hoped for but spread powers sometimes concurrently, among county and district councils. The councils designated as local education authorities were not all allocated identical other functions; non-metropolitan counties have a different range of functions from metropolitan districts. Reorganisation did not bring about any significant change in the basis of local government finance.

Subject to the changes affecting the school health service (out), the careers service (in, and no longer discretionary), and divisional executives and excepted districts (gone), no changes were made in the duties and powers of local education authorities, the relationships between the Secretary of State for Education and Science and the local education authorities, or in the structure of the education service from DES to nursery schools.

So, put very simply, the April 1974 situation was that new local education authorities had been set up to do the same job as their predecessors, in the expectation that they would, generally speaking, be able to do that job better. The structure of the educational system remained largely as it had been prior to

reorganisation.

So instead of hearing the question: "Should education remain in local government?" we ought rather to be hearing approving noises about the way in which reformed local government has met the problems and challenges of 1974-77. The system which the new local education authorities had inherited was a pretty good one. It had provided a basis for thirty years of vast achievement. The education service based in local government had implemented massive building programmes for primary, secondary and further education; provided secondary education for all, reorganising at least once and often twice in the process; staffed and equipped the new schools and other institutions; coped with growth and shift of population; brought about and encouraged innovations; responded to the government's demands to expand initial teacher training provision urgently; promoted further and higher education; greatly expanded the provision for special education; fostered the youth service and careers service; and developed a range of new institutions, activities and support services, hardly available at all previously. The administration of the service, based on the 1944 Act, was well understood, relationships had been established and lines of communication and responsibilities were generally clear.

There is a great deal of scope for argument about the merits and disadvantages of centralised and decentralised educational systems, and there is not the opportunity here to develop the argument. The facts are that the system in England and Wales provides for a distribution of duties, powers and functions among central government, local government, governing and managing bodies, academic boards, and principals and heads of colleges and schools, that the Secretary of State has no power to decide the curriculum of schools, that a great deal of initiative rests with local education authorities and with institutions, and that schools and colleges have very great independence in the deployment of the resources allocated to them. Whether all these represent unmixed blessings is not for discussion here but they do at least show that, despite the considerable powers and controls of the Secretary of State, the present educational system avoids the concentration of power and initiative

at the centre.

I have identified an effective decentralised framework for the education service. My next point is that it provides a good working basis for the exercise of sensitivity and responsiveness, and for effective relationships and accountability, and a great deal of potential for further developments in these respects. I cannot believe that the allocation of the education function to, say, central government (with or without out-stations) or to non-elected boards or to large regional bodies would result in a service sensitive and responsive to individual and community interests and needs and with the potential to be more sensitive and responsive than existing local education authorites. Features of the present system are:-

1. Accessibility of LEA Education Offices to the public.

2. Member(s) of public able to take up a matter with an elected member of the authority, who can see the CEO about it or raise it, or arrange to have it raised, at the Education Committee, or ask a question or move a resolution at the Council. Education Committee and Council meetings are open to the public.

3. Ad hoc groups, societies, local communities and others able to communicate direct with elected representatives and council as a whole and to follow up the communication.

4. Managing and governing bodies of schools and colleges provide a basis for community participation on a considerable scale in the organisation of education, for the accountability of institutions, act as a further channel of communication with the authority. Local education authorities have taken the initiative over recent years in widening representation on governing and managing bodies of schools with no encouragement from central government.

5. Public consultation on educational matters is easily arranged by local education authorities, whether on their own initiative or in response to requests. Adjustments to catchment areas,

closures of small schools, reorganisation on comprehensive lines, school accommodation problems are all the subject of close consultation with parents and the public at large. For example, in my former authority we prepared a draft plan to deal with the hundred or so old primary schools which had not yet been provided with modern accommodation. The draft was the subject of over a hundred local public meetings arranged by Managers at the request of the Authority. Following an analysis of the reports of these meetings the Authority arranged forty more local public meetings at each of which the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Education Committee and the Chief Education Officer or a Deputy/ Senior Assistant Education Officer were present. Nearly fifty revisions were made to the draft in the light of the observations made at these public meetings before a plan was approved by the Education Committee. Public consultations on a proportionately similar scale had previously taken place concerning a plan for the reorganisation of secondary education on comprehensive lines.

> (In contrast it is to be noted that in the area of further and higher education and of initial teacher training, which are subject to considerable central government control and direction, there has recently been a massive reorganisation with, as far as central government was concerned, total disregard for the concept of public consultation, as though the issues involved were solely the concern of a closed group dominated by central government and the institutions excluding the wider community.)

So with a system with such achievement, capacity and potential, largely unchanged by the Local Government Act, what has gone wrong, to make the question of the continuation of the education service within local government no longer the academic question which it would have been, say ten years ago?

Certainly, local government reorganisation, which would have been a difficult enough operation even in favourable circumstances took effect in extremely difficult economic conditions and the

economic climate has remained difficult ever since. Thus the first three years experience of local government reorganisation have been associated with major cuts in recurrent and capital expenditure in the education service and local government reorganisation is inevitably associated with deteriorating services.

It may perhaps be considered that the present arrangements for the financing of local authorities are inimical to the interests of education. Certainly when it was proposed to introduce general grant, the fore-runner of rate support grant, there were many in the education service who campaigned against the idea and for the retention of specific grant. One of the declared aims of the removal of specific grant and the introduction of a general grant in aid of most local government expenditure taken together was greater freedom for local authorities. I do not think there is any doubt that the abolition of specific grant and the introduction of general, later rate support grant placed education much more in a situation of competition with other local authority services when budgets were being prepared. It also decreased the ability of education committees to develop and innovate. But in the days when inflation was not running at a high level the rate support grant system did not, generally speaking, bear all that heavily on the education service; the major constraint was the reduced financial elbow-room for improvement and innovation. The continuing economic crisis has adversely affected all local government services and I know of no proof that education has suffered more than other services. One can confidently assert that education is having a tough time because of the economic situation; one can claim with conviction that there are flaws in the financing of local government expenditure on education and other services. But these two factors do not make a case for the transfer of education out of local government.

Even in favourable economic circumstances, the most optimistic could foresee problems and difficulties arising from local government reorganisation. The bringing together of education departments and institutions from different authorites, the establishment of new relationships. (teachers with administrative officers,

administrative officers with each other and with members, members with members and so on), the formulation of policy, the establishment of practice, the acquisition of new knowledge, the loss of the relevance of some previous relationships, experience and knowledge, could all be expected, and could be expected to make administration more difficult in the early years of reorganised local government. But such difficulties do not amount to an argument for education to be taken out of local government.

Changes in personnel - among officers and members - are not uncommon in local government in normal circumstances; the organisation has adjusted to them as and when they have occurred and taken them in its stride. But 1974 brought about a deluge of change in personnel. Many members and officers also had to adjust in 1974 to the appearance of party politics in local government. There had been areas of the country where party politics had been absent or very unobtrusive and areas where there had been strong party political traditions. In some instances both kinds of area were brought together in a single new authority with a resulting extension of the party political approach, which is one of the principal features of local government reorganisation. There are points of incompatibility between education and party politics but nevertheless many local educational administrators have worked in authorities where elected members are organised on party political lines. That others, members and officers, have had difficulty in adjusting to the changed situation and that some difficulties have stemmed from party politics in local government, I have no doubt.

The Local Government Act of 1972, as I have already pointed out, did not of itself change the structure, or compel a change in the operation of the educational system. And the changes associated with the period following reorganisation to which I have referred do not logically lead to a questioning of the location of education in local government. But there have been other changes.

Prior to local government reorganisation there was in most authorities no doubt that responsibility for the administration of the

education service at local authority level rested with the Education Committee and the CEO and his department. Of course there were constraints. Some authorities did not delegate powers to the education committees. Guidelines as to acceptable growth in real terms were often laid down by Finance Committees in advance of budget preparation and education budgets prepared by the Education Department and Committee were subject to the scrutiny of the Finance Committee and approval of the Council. The numbers and grades of staff in the Education Department were often subject to the approval of the Staff and Establishment Committee. But other departments were little involved in the actual appointment of education staff and never in the appointment of staffs of schools and colleges. The Education Department was often responsible for the clerking of the Education Sub-Committee and officers of other departments might only be involved when their professional expertise (law, audit) was needed or when joint projects, common problems, and issues requiring inter-departmental consultations were being dealt with. Communication was between schools and the CEO and never with other chief officers except in such day to day matters as salary queries, payment of accounts, etc. Collaboration and consultation with other departments and committees were, contrary to what some people thought, frequent; they were purposeful and task-centred and took place on the initiative of the individual departments and committees. Schools, colleges, teachers' associations, parents and the public generally were in no doubt about which committee and which officer were responsible for the overall administration of the education service. They communicated with and negotiated with the Education Department/ Committee. And they generally regarded the Education Committee and the CEO as representing the cause of education within the local authority.

During the years prior to local government reorganisation assertions were being made that the effectiveness of local government was impeded because of excessive departmentalism and separatism within local government. Committees and departments were accused of working in isolation and of preparing plans and implementing projects without any attempt at co-ordination, thereby

missing opportunities for the more effective use of resources. The needs of the community served by a local authority could not be neatly separated out on a departmental/committee basis and a corporate approach was said to be needed. The authority needed a committee which would have a co-ordinating policy function and a chief officer who would be the leader of a team of chief officers each of whom would contribute to corporate management within the authority and who would not regard themselves solely as the custodians of individual services.

Ideas about management in local government found further expression in 1972 in the report "The new local authorities: management and structure", prepared by a study group set up by the Department of the Environment and the local authority associations and commonly referred to as the Bains Report. It urged - a corporate approach; the establishment of a Policy and Resources Committee concerned with policy formulation and implementation of the community plan, with the setting of objectives and priorities, with co-ordinating and controlling the implementation of those objectives and monitoring and reviewing performance; the appointment of a chief executive free of departmental responsibilities to lead a team of chief officers to secure overall co-ordination and control; and the appointment of a senior officer responsible for personnel management. It is worth mentioning the stress laid in the report on the appointment of a well qualified personnel officer, whose major role would be advising in the personnel policy area; the report suggested that education and other services which traditionally had been largely independent of the central organisation should look to the personnel department for advice and assistance in personnel management matters. Included in the report were possible management structures.

In his foreword to the report the Secretary of State for the Environment said that if the appropriate suggestions in the report were applied to authorities then local government in the future would be far more efficient and effective than ever before.

There is no doubt that the Bains Report had a considerable influence

on the preparations made during the run-up period to local government reorganisation and that the committee and management structures adopted by many of the new authorities drew heavily on the Report. It is debatable whether the Report was invariably interpreted as its authors intended; it is even more debatable whether the validity of the thinking behind it was questioned or whether the suggestions in it were critically examined prior to their adoption.

I am in no doubt that much of the present concern about the position of the education service in local government stems directly from the committee and management arrangements adopted by local authorities on reorganisation and from the attitudes of the people using them. Now I know that if I were to examine the management operations of an individual authority and to demonstrate its shortcomings, I might well be told "That is not what Bains recommended", "They didn't understand Bains", "They failed to grasp the philosophy of the advocates of corporate management". In this context it does not matter whether the management structure of the authority represents a misinterpretation of Bains or of anybody else. What matters is how things have actually worked out, what people are really doing, the visible effects on the Education service and what will happen if nothing is done to remedy the situation.

Of course I am not claiming that things are bad in every authority. This would be far from the truth. But up and down the country in a number of authorities there are some very disturbing situations and trends on which I am going to concentrate.

Let it be quite clear from the outset that my concern and that of educational administrators is for the quality of education, for the ability of local government to sustain and develop it, and for the ability of heads, principals and others to manage institutions effectively. I am certain that CEO's and their colleagues everywhere are doing their best for education, sometimes in very adverse circumstances.

There is very considerable dissatisfaction with the management systems adopted by certain local authorities following reorganisation, and in efficiency and effectiveness many of them compare unfavourably with those which existed prior to 1974. The decision making process has become more complicated and involves more committees, sub-committees and officers than previously. An Education Committee may be ignored when educational matters are being considered. Functions have been taken away from Education Committees in some cases and attempts to remove further functions or decision making powers are not infrequent. There is a concentration of power in Committees and Officers not responsible for services. The clerking of the Education Committee and Sub-Committee meetings by staff from outside the Education Department is more expensive, unduly complicated and time-wasting, cumbersome, slow, causing duplication and difficulties. The growth of the involvement of the Personnel Sub-Committee in staffing matters has brought about complications, inefficiencies and delays. Corporate management teams are not contributing to the effectiveness of the education service nor are they enabling the education service to contribute to others; they are spending time on trivia. There is evidence of considerable waste of manpower, time and effort arising out of the management practices of authorities. Another area of concern is the way in which some Chief Education Officers and other senior education officers are compelled to waste time in attending meetings which are often unproductive or deal with trivia, in explaining educational matters to non-education officers for them to convey to someone else to present to a committee. Officers from other Departments waste their time coming to Education Committees at which they have no useful contribution to make or function to perform. There are far more meetings, far more paperwork, far more report production, to little or no purpose. A cumbersome, arbitary, insensitive bureaucracy has been superimposed. It goes without saying that inefficiency, time-wasting, the employment of staff who do not contribute to the effectiveness of local government, but rather the reverse, are financially very costly.

It has been necessary to speak in rather general terms having regard

to the constraints of my paper. The overall impression is that in a number of areas there has been a great deal of change which is costing a great deal in manpower and money for very little return or for negative results. Structures, procedures, practices and attitudes are at variance with the basic aims of devoting the resources of time, money and manpower to the meeting of community needs and to the integrated management of services.

"Ah, well", the people in the schools and colleges may say, "it doesn't matter to us if the CEO and his chaps are fed up with the new style bumbledom. Let the people in the Town/County Hall play their corporate management game with each other; it really doesn't matter to us." I believe that the facts which I have summarised in the previous paragraph do matter to the people in the field. But if they don't seem close enough to home, let me offer a few real life examples and see whether you think they matter to the people in schools and colleges and whether they affect the effective and efficient running of an institution. You will not be able from these examples, and others quoted later, to trace the authorities from which they are drawn but I can assure you that they are real; they are drawn from a number of places, not just one or two. Imagine you are the head of a school or the principal of a college, depending on the example:-

1. You need approval to a variation in the use of score points. You must apply. Your application has to be referred to the Policy and Resources Committee who will in turn remit the matter to a Sub-Committee. You wait. Minimum time for decision - three months.

2. A school meals employee applies for a day's leave of absence without pay. She wonders what is happening to her application. You enquire. You find that seven or eight officers in the Town/County Hall are involved in the decision.

3. You are appointing a school clerk. A representative of the Personnel Officer (remember? - the man who was to have an important advisory role in personnel policy), has to take part in the actual selection and you are not allowed to make the

appointment without his presence at the interviews.

4. You have a problem relating to the non-teaching staff establishment of your institution. The Education Committee has no power to decide. A review is required. Two years have passed and you are still waiting for the review, without which there can be no decision.

5. A vacancy arises within an agreed staffing scale. You must apply for permission to fill it. A senior education officer is required to vet your application, a Chairman is required to agree it; it then goes to the Personnel Officer for consideration, then to the Management Team, then to the Management Group.

Now you may say with regard to example 5 that this is not due to Corporate Management but to the economic situation and the control of manpower. Certainly, there may be the reason for monitoring; but is that procedure the best that new improved corporate management could devise? Economic difficulties have made management more difficult but a reasonable test of management is to examine the skill with which it copes with difficulties.

Decisions affecting education are being taken without reference to the Education Committee or the Chief Education Officer. (An interim report of the Bains group had recommended in 1971, prior to the passing of the Local Government Act 1972, the abolition of the statutory requirements concerning the appointment of Education Committees and CEO's).

"So what?" you may say. "It doesn't matter to us if the dignity of the Chairman of the Education Committee or of the CEO is dented now and again. Probably does them good." But on reflection you will see that this means that these decisions are being taken without reference to the needs of schools and colleges, or rather of the people in them. As educationalists surely you cannot be content if:-

1. A Committee other than the Education Committee may without reference to the Education Committee, commit expenditure out of the education minor works allocation, an allocation which the Education Committee carefully endeavours to parcel out to schools in accordance with priority needs.

2. A Committee other than the Education Committee approves plans for new school and college buildings and the Education Committee is barred from seeing them because they are dealt with by a Sub-Committee of the Policy and Resources Committee.

3. A Committee other than the Education Committee decides on the amount of take-up of the Building Programme allocation without the Education Committee having any say in the matter.

4. A Committee other than the Education Committee puts an embargo on the filling of vacancies, including the appointment of temporary supply teachers.

5. The authority's central purchasing organisation lets a contract for school books, without reference to the CEO, to a firm which proves to be incapable of fulfilling the contract.

6. When you apply for permission to fill a vacancy the decision is taken by a committee other than the Education Committee and no representative of the Education Committee or of the CEO is present when the matter is considered. There is also a delay of some weeks.

7. Important educational items are removed, without reference to the CEO, from the draft Education Committee agenda by a Management Group which excludes the CEO.

8. By means of the management structure of the Authority, the CEO is instructed that he may not spell out to the Education Committee or to the Authority the educational implications of the cuts made in the Education Estimates.

9. Decisions affecting teachers taken by a Committee other than the Education Committee result in confrontation with Trade Unions, the schools feel the backlash and the education service has to cope with a difficulty not of its own making and which might have been prevented.

10. The Council considers reports on educational matters prepared by officers outside the Education Department and without reference to the Education Committee.

11. Teaching staff: pupil ratios are not dealt with by the Education Committee.

Of course, I know that all these problems do not happen in all authorities and probably most of them do not happen in most authorities. I hope they do not happen in your authority but they do happen and the apparent increase in the numbers of such occurrences gives cause for real concern by those who have the education service at heart.

Associated with the point about decisions affecting education being taken by Committees other than the Education Committee is the fragmentation of the administration of education within the local education authority. Thus the integrated administration of the service is hindered or prevented. Accountability for the effectiveness of the service is lost in a mismanagement maze. Decisions about education are being taken by committees and officers who are ignorant of and insensitive to the needs of institutions and individuals and who are not faced with the responsibility of dealing with the consequences of their wrong decisions. There has been a "hiving off" of Education Committee functions to other Committees. There are indications of further attempts at fragmentation - attempts to make teaching staff the responsibility of the Personnel Committee, to remove from the CEO the job of preparing educational briefs for the design of new school buildings, to transfer the Youth Service from the Education Committee to another Committee. Far from management being genuinely corporate there are examples of a concentration of power in Committees and officers not directly concerned with the provision of services to the community and a

centralising tendency which runs counter to the administration of education. In many areas there is dissatisfaction among teachers and teachers' associations concerning the detrimental effects on the education service of the management systems of local education authorities. The consequences of such dissatisfaction could be extremely grave for the education service and local government.

Nevetheless, all those grave wrongs do not constitute - yet - a reason for education to be taken out of local government. It is a fact that there are local education authorities where, sometimes with difficulty, services are enabled to meet community needs and act effectively, corporate consideration is given to matters appropriate to corporate consideration and there is no interference in matters which are not, priorities are balanced and resources allocated, departments collaborate, and so on.

The important point about the situation which I have illustrated is that it does not arise from overwhelming external forces, like the price of oil, inflation, and a spate of legislation, which are outside the control of local government. The situation is caused by the actions, motives and attitudes of people inside local government and their manipulation of their concept of corporate management. Capable of creating the situation, they are therefore capable of changing it if they want to. It now depends on whether those members and officers who are responsible are prepared to recognise the mistakes which they have made (the mistakes are there to be seen; is there the will to see them?) and to accept that the overriding concern of local government is not to create a top-heavy, cumbersome, centralised, arbitary bureaucracy but to meet the needs of the community by the most effective use of the resources available. This was, I believe, supposed to be the aim of corporate management. It is ironic that so much of the post reorganisation management has produced the opposite result.

If those local education authorities which have reduced and are currently reducing the quality and effectiveness of the education service by virtue of their internal management take steps to correct their mistakes and to reverse the trend and allow educational

administration to operate on a satisfactory footing, then I would see no argument for the transfer of education out of local government. I do not regard unavoidable post-reorganisation difficulties or questions of local government finance and of the control of higher education as presenting insoluble problems; in my view both can be dealt with without any change in the present structure of the education system. I am convinced of the overall intrinsic advantages of the present statutory framework. But if sufficient people in local government are determined consciously or unconsciously, to destroy the effective administration of education by local government (and probably at the same time to destroy local government, at least in its present form) and to make it impossible for the heads and principals and staffs of schools and colleges to manage their institutions and be accountable for them, then education must get out of compendious local authorities - not to central government, not to appointed boards, not to vast regional authorities, but to democratically elected single-purpose local bodies responsible for education from nursery schools to polytechnics, and receiving government grant and local revenue (direct and not by precept).

Response by Derek Williams, Director, Gloucestershire College of Higher Education, formerly Chief Education Officer, Avon.

I would like to extend a little further Winter's commentary on Corporate Management, as I have been concerned with further issues raised in the application of Bains-type Corporate Management systems.

The role and responsibilities of each Committee and of each Administrative Department in the management system must be defined precisely and accurately. Winter has given us enough examples of the failures to co-ordinate policy and administration for me not to have to recite further illustrations. What is clear is that without the efficient co-ordination of Committee and Departmental functions, there will be indecision and duplication of

management controls, and conflict and chaos in policy-making. No organisational structure can be efficient without an adequate definition of functions and terms of reference - and definition only needs competent draughtsmanship. Very few Corporate Management systems are well defined, with clear and comprehensive terms of reference ... Why? Is it because the architects of the new Authorities have not been able to cross the Ts and dot the Is of their structures for lack of know-how or understanding of the Corporate Management philosophy? Or because they are content to have created a vacuum of control which they can manipulate and exploit?

The management of resources and the management of resources and the management of services cannot be discrete and distinct from each other. Corporate Management emphasizes the importance of the control and direction of resources; and the Bains Report stressed the managerial efficiency that results from the establishment of resource committees and resource departments designed to apply common systems of resource management across the diversity of services provided by a local authority. It gave little attention to the managerial role and functions of service committees and departments in the corporate system, except to look for a simplification of them and a reduction in their number. The conclusion to be drawn from this emphasis, and one made by the founder members of many of the new local authorities established since reorganisation, is that the resource committees and departments of the Authority shall have exclusive and total control of their particular resource in each service, be it education, the social services or the 'programme area' of public protection.

A Land and Buildings Committee should be responsible for the total management of the Authority's physical resources - and schools are no different from highway depots and empy properties awaiting development. A Personnel Committee should be responsible for the management of the Authority's total manpower - and teachers are equally the employees of the council as refuse collectors. A Finance Committee should be responsible for money management and budget control - and a Polytechnic is the same as a fire station

in this respect. By the same reasoning it is the chief officer and his departmental staff concerned with a resource - manpower, materials or money - who should exercise executive direction of that resource. A Director of Personnel Services will claim to manage at least the non-teaching staff of a school - its laboratory technicians, caretakers and cleaners, and kitchen staff; where the head of the school is expected to have any role at all in such man management, he acts under the instructions of the Director, not on the advice of the Chief Education Officer. Similarly, a Director of Estates Services will expect to decide the priorities of maintaining and improving school premises and establish his priorities on technical grounds not for educational reasons as would a Chief Education Officer if he had that responsibility. The same Director will also expect that the maintenance of the buildings and grounds of a Polytechnic should be undertaken by his central team of workmen, not by a staff responsible to the Polytechnic itself. The Treasurer will expect to supervise the expenditure of a school on equipment and teaching materials, and impose financial criteria rather than educational judgements in his management function.

Managerial control by resource officers not only accentuates central resource management at the expense of service considerations, but opens the door to such officers claiming and making professional service judgements. In one case, a finance officer examining the level of expenditure undertaken on centres for the in-service training of teachers, felt sufficiently competent to recommend their closure on the grounds that the in-service training recommendations of the James Committee had not been adopted as government policy. In another case, it was possible for an architect, without consultation with the education officer, to recommend the exclusion of an essential teaching area from the plans of a new school. And in another, for a Personnel Officer to advise his committee that tutor-librarians in schools and colleges were inappropriately paid on teacher salary scales.

Where resource control and management is exercised in this way - concentrated in the resource committees and departments - the

'programme area' committees and the professional service officers have little or no management function left them. Nor, indeed, have heads of schools and principals of colleges.

The management of the services is fragmented and dispersed between the individual resource committees and officers and there is no co-ordination of their decisions and management directions. There is, in fact, too little real corporate management and too many unco-ordinated managers.

The educationists' attitude to the new local authority management structures would be different (and welcoming) if it was recognised that the prime requirement of managing a service as complex and sophisticated as the education service is to achieve the co-ordinated and rational use of resources, and that it is the proper and professional role of education officers and heads and principals to manage the resource allocated to them within the broad terms and advices of the resource management specialists. Corporate planning for the allocation of resources is the necessary role of resource committees; and the execution of those allocations, and the framing of general administrative systems for their use and control, is the proper job of resource officers. However, it is only the service managers who can exercise adequate professional judgements as to the detailed application of control systems and the actual use of resources; and to deny them such functions hazards the efficiency and effectiveness of the public services. The complexities of local government decision-making and administration inevitably create different levels of managerial activity, and the practice of corporate management further complicates rather than simplifies the organisation of a local authority. If it is to be truly corporate, the management of the public services must be based upon practical and precise role specifications between the resource and service elements of the management structure - committees and administrative departments alike.

Geoffrey Winters' crucial question in his paper is whether or not those members and officers who have created the situation in which the Education Service now finds itself are prepared to

recognise and rectify their mistakes.

I would not be hopeful that they are - indeed in the Authority I have left, I was forced to conclude they were not.

I draw three conclusions from my own experience and the general trend:

1. There is a remarkable self-satisfaction among the controlling politicians and that category of Local Government Chief Officers we now call Resource Officers - Chief Executives, Treasurers, Directors of Personnel and Land and Buildings. Modern politicians in L.G. demand the reality of power, and the Resource Officers need to have a finger in the education pie to maintain their new-found status. They are the first division. The Programme Area/Service Officers are the second division.

2. The same Politicians and Resource Officers can claim to be implementing Corporate Management principles as expounded by Bains, and in these days of scarce resources for the public services, resource control, economic management, is the absolute essential. Neither service officers - Chief Education Officers particularly, nor Principals and Heads are regarded as being managerially competent. And many of us aren't. We've certainly had little management training. The Peter Principle is all too evident in the Education Service - good teachers getting promotion out of the classroom into the office to do a job they don't understand. If we are to claim to manage the Education Service we must prove our managerial competence.

3. My third conclusion is that those who impose what my Education colleagues in Avon called "corporate punishment" upon the Education Service are doing so because they share and can exploit the widespread criticism the service faces. Geoffrey Winter has mentioned the attempt to abolish the statutory requirement upon LEAs to appoint Education Committees. The provision in legislation for nominated members of

Education Committees has since been attacked; and the Association of Education Committees has since been killed off because it was too powerful and independent a voice for the Education Service in national affairs. All this is the doing of Local Government politicians and senior Local Government Officers. The so-called Great Debate has brought out publicly an hostility which has been growing for twenty years. The case against Education is expressed in plausible terms and can be powerfully put.

I can summarise it briefly: in the last twenty years education has had more than its fair share of the available cake. It has grown so that it now demands almost 70% of local government expenditure. It has little to show for this investment apart from hundreds of palatial new buildings - comprehensive schools and Polytechnics especially. Achievement standards have declined; teachers control the curriculum but have introduced teaching and learning methods that are ineffective. There is more indiscipline, vandalism and downright rebellion among the young than ever before; and the real world of industry and commerce complain that the school and college leaver has no skill with which to start work, and no appetite to give a fair day's work in return for his high wages.

It's a short step from taking control and managing the resources made available to the Education Service, to deciding what actual teaching and learning materials it might have and then dictating the curriculum. Those now in control of Local Government are about to take that step. And I' m not at all sure that we as a profession are capable of stopping them. But like Geoffrey Winter, I believe that if Local Government destroys the Education Service, it will destroy itself. In which case we must seriously begin to define the alternatives, not just talk about them.

Response by Kenneth Lambert,
Headmaster, Great Barr School, Birmingham.

There is little with which any practising schoolmaster could disagree in Geoffrey Winter's paper. Indeed, it demonstrates a degree of concern for the schools and colleges, their heads and principals, which seems all too rare.

Yet if my count is correct, it fails to mention the word 'child' or the word 'student' once. Surely this is what educational administration is all about - providing the resources of all kinds to provide for the education of children and students in individual educational institutions. This is how perhaps the issue should be judged - which - Central or Local Government can provide the better service of educational administration.

There is no doubt, as Winter says, that education through its local administration has achieved a great deal since the war - indeed its productivity must bear comparison with much of British industry. Before reorganisation many of us had a confidence in our administrators which reflected a genuine partnership. The high hopes of greater things in 1974 have largely been dissipated. Corporate management has seemed to many of us to be an unmitigated disaster. Our masters and colleagues are no longer confined to the education service, but we must increasingly take account of the Personnel Committee, the Leisure Services department, and the Parks department. The consequence of the resultant corporate management discussions have been inordinate delays in decision making, so bad in some cases that the functioning of individual institutions must be adversely affected. Some of the examples of delay which Winter gives seem to be moderate in the extreme. Of course there is delay within the service itself and one wonders if its morale is not being sapped by corporate management. But perhaps of more importance is the feeling that corporate management had not brought with it the benefits of improved co-operation with other departments, particularly the social services departments. Lack of co-operation in this area can have profound implications

for both services as cases attracting public attention in recent years have demonstrated.

Bureaucracy has also multiplied - there is, as Geoffrey Winter has said, more paper, more meetings, a plethora of discussion - but to what end? There has been an expansion of the advisory services - but presence in schools in an advisory capacity seems to be increasingly in inverse proportion to the amount of time spent in meetings. And still some educational administrators criticise schools, particularly large ones, for the amount of non-teaching time devoted to administration - i.e. often endeavouring to solve the problems of a family at one end and those of other local government departments at the other.

One suspects that there is now more political interference than before reorganisation and consequent political pressure and Winter hints at this. A consistent education policy would help administrators and schools alike; a consistent policy by one party would, as they say in advertisements, be an advantage. Not only party but teacher politicians are involved however. The teacher variety operate at national - Schools Council - level, and at local level - LEA working parties or consultative committees for whom I appear increasingly to work. But whilst this vast game of bureaucratic musical chairs was going on the world was changing - economic stringency, changing social attitudes and political pressure. I am not blaming much of the resultant mess on reorganisation or on local government or indeed the education service. We are, however, too anxious to bow down before the current gods.

Consultation, participation, accessibility. What proportion of parents use accessibility - judging by the number who roll up for elections to governing bodies, precious few. What about accessibility for heads who in at least one LEA can't attend the meetings of their governing body as of right?

Would centralised administration help? I recoil from the political implications of a centrally controlled curriculum, although I see advantages in a geographically mobile society. The central

70

authorities seem already to have made their vote of no confidence in the schools. The Prime Minister thinks we are falling down on the job; Shirley Williams is unaware that many schools have been fulfilling the schools part of her contract for many years; the Minister of State at the HMA conference suggested colleges could do the job better; and Dennis Howell thinks we should not have abolished boxing. The DES has produced some highly suspect figures on Sixth Form viability which will destroy sixth forms in schools, of which it approved quite recently; it asks for viability in terms of group sizes far above those acceptable in past grammar schools; The Holland Report seems to have been scarcely resisted by the DES; there has been a veritable rash of indecision about CEE, 16+ and N and F.

The Great Debate and the Green Paper were stillborn; it looks as though the Taylor Report should have been aborted. The attempt to set up the Blessed Tom Taylor Comprehensive seems to be the classic example of the British propensity for seeking the solution to problems by creating new ones.

I share Geoffrey Winter's confidence that basically local government can do the job but I would appeal for:

1. Stressing the autonomy and accountability of individual educational institutions.

2. The enforcement of the attendance laws would improve standards. Truancy is not a major problem - condoned absence is and it is often condoned by parents as well as LEAs.

3. Support for schools in discipline problems. Remember we control many of those football hooligans in school every day of the week and get work out of them.

4. Support for schools with words of encouragement in public when under attack in the press and in other media.

5. Facing up to the problem of insufficient teachers. The methods are there and ultimately teachers will not support

those who are a drag on the profession.

I cannot agree with all of what Robert Spooner said but by implication he argued that the debate at this conference is of monumental irrelevance. What did reorganisation mean to the average teacher at the chalk face. Another duplicated signature on his correspondence from the office, a new contract which he signed but didn't read. For heads and school administrators an increasing amount of frustration. I suspect the frustration would be greater if education were administered at national level. Could local administrators give schools a little more credit for knowing their job, letting them get on with it, supporting them when justified, and taking positive action when they are obviously inefficient. Perhaps it remains the lesser of two very dubious evils.

THE WAY AHEAD

John Stewart,
Director of the Institute of Local Government Studies at the University of Birmingham

Those happy days are no more. Malignant doctrines, malignant theories of management have changed it all and many of you, if I read the conference papers aright, would like to go back to those happy, glorious days. I do not actually remember them but some of you evidently do. I have to say that, though for a period of time I used to claim no connection with corporate management because it was popular, to some extent I am the author of the malignant doctrine. Let us begin to examine it.

The first thing I have to say is that you cannot go back. The things that people object to are not really due to malign doctrine or even malign individuals. There are certain forces in society that are changing the face of education and it is only because of the existence of these forces that certain doctrines and certain views have become predominant. Corporate management, even in its most imperfect form, is itself a response to these pressures. It is proper to debate whether the response is right, but first of all let us get a diagnosis.

What is it that is changing the face of educational administration and with it the rest of public administration in this country? I accept that education between say 1955 and 1965 was well and adequately run for the purposes and nature of society at that time. But you cannot run education in that way today. Education has itself created some of the main forces in society demanding stronger participation and stronger involvement, and cannot protect itself from the consequences of what it has created. Let us look at these changes, some of which are going to be important in influencing the pattern of educational administration in this country in the way ahead.

Firstly let us consider population change. One of the great issues facing the whole of the public services in this country is the massive change in population structure which we face over the next ten years. A most important document, I believe, is the Central Policy Review staff document. 'Population and the Social Services' because that spells out the consequences of the population changes we face over the next decade. It is not only the massive reduction in school population, it is equally the massive rise in population over 75 that we have to think about. The CPRS document shows that one of the main problems facing this country is its capacity to move resources from one element of the public sector to another element, with massively declining school population and a massively rising population over 75. No particular service or even any particular part of a service can be looked at in isolation. The population structure of this country requires that no major resource user should look at his problems in isolation.

Secondly, we are increasingly aware of a whole series of important issues which can only be imperfectly seen through the eyes of particular services or particular functions. Let me mention three to you:

1. The inner city - the problem of the inner city is one that no service and no function can tackle on its own, education least of all, and there must be queries as to whether the particular way in which our central government and local government look at the problems of the inner city have been adequate to its needs. The case is made in document after document on the problems that inter-relate in the inner city that simple functionalism, the fragmentation of government with massive functional units, provides no answer to these problems.

2. We face massive problems of the unemployed and the young employed. We have been taught the hard way that many functions that look as though they were self-contained are far from that. The exercise of the planning function using many planning criteria in the inner city has created unemployment

problems there. In other words, many of the emergining issues that are of deep concern to our society are such that they cannot be dealt with by a simple functional approach alone.

3. There is also the energy problem. The nature of the communities we have built, including perhaps the size of the schools, has been based up to now upon the assumption of a society in which there was limitless energy. For 20 years we have built a pattern of communities and transport systems upon that basis.

Those are three problems that enforce the lesson that you cannot look at the problems of education in isolation. The whole history of urban government in this country for the last 20 years has taught us of the interaction between services in the inner city and in the outer city as well.

Even more important in affecting the nature of educational administration is the decline of acceptance in our society. In one of the conference papers it was argued that teachers should be given the same automatic acceptance that doctors have. But can anybody seriously believe that the authority of doctors is not also under challenge? There is today a decline in acceptance of authority, thanks in many ways to education, and I give you credit for it. There is a challenge to government as to its right to govern in certain areas. Many of the procedures of government, such as planning and road enquiries, are built on the assumption that few people will use them because people will accept authority. The new Ombudsman procedures are built upon the assumption that few people will use them and yet many will and many do. There is a decline in the acceptance of authority. We have to recognize it and find ways of getting authority accepted, but anybody who believes you can get acceptance of authority without some move in the direction that the Taylor Report has indicated, is, I think, living in a dream world. The world has changed, it cannot go back. Old patterns of administration are breaking down. I am not saying that we should accept all the pressures of society, but the one thing you have to do is to recognize them.

Next there is the new politics. Anyone who believes seriously that in any institutional form education can escape the pressures of politics is living in a dream world. Many local authorities have recently gone through a much bigger change than corporate management, the change from being non-political to being political. I do not think there is any escape from politics. Politics in this country is about differences of view, about how resources should be developed and about how particular policies should be implemented. There are value judgements that society is no longer willing to see left to the professional. People may not like the politician but they cannot get rid of him and the politician's power cannot be ignored in the present situation.

There is one further important change, and that is the movement from a period of resource plenty, a period when we could assume automatic growth, to a period of resource scarcity. It is not simply that one must accept resource restraint. What I am saying is more subtle and more difficult, something I barely understand fully myself. That is, that the influence of the assumption of real growth was very, very deep in the management practice of local government. In a world where one could assume growth the arguments were less about whether than about when. If you think about some of the great debates in local authorities they were about the phasing of projects. One of the papers ends by referring to 'a wonderful opportunity to provide adequate resources for schools for the first time ever'. That language is totally out of date for we have moved from a period of resource growth to a world where nobody can any longer assume automatic growth in resources.

Every organisation works by the assumptions it makes. Many of the things we wrote about corporate planning were from a world of growth, a world in which we lived. Both local government and educational administration are better described in terms of influences and pressures, a complex mass of pressures and influences, rather than in terms of formal rules. It must be the role of a serious student of educational administration, not necessarily to accept my analysis but to think about the changes and the pressures,

trying to interpret things like corporate management and local government reorganisation and working to see the extent to which it is necessary for educational administration to meet those pressures and, if they do not like particular solutions, working towards other solutions.

If you object to a particular change, fight against it, but the one thing you cannot do is to avoid the issues by opting out of them. If, for example, you took education out of local government, there is not one of those issues which you would have opted out of. You would not have opted out of politics, or of the resource issue, or of community pressures, though they might have taken different forms. The most important thing, surely, is to recognize what the real challenge is, namely, to work out how community pressures can be reconciled with administrative form and processes.

It will be clear from the above that I do not regard corporate management as an accident, but as a response to certain forces. Let us consider, for instance, the resource issue. When I spoke about corporate management a few years ago I would have presented it to you as an ideal. I would have told you how the skill of the education officer, the solicitor and the architect, merged together in building a golden Sheffield - now I have to say that corporate management from having been an ideal is a harsh necessity and that you cannot think about the resource issues of local government without thinking corporately. There were other factors, such as the recognition that in many ways our system of urban government had failed to solve the problems with which it was faced but it was basically an awareness of resources, the corporate resource, an awareness of interaction in the community, that were the driving forces behind corporate management.

I am not here to say that many of the forms taken by corporate management are correct, or to say that they are wrong. There may be many things wrong with corporate management, but I imagine there are many things wrong with a traditional school and with a traditional LEA. There are some authorities, however, where education officers seem quite excited and hopeful about the

things that are happening. There are education officers who are deeply committed to corporate management and who have not done so badly on resources either. But that is a narrower issue. What I am saying is, that there is a great variety of practice. Is it not time to try to study the situation constructively? To try not merely to blame, but to praise, to say that things have been well done, as well as that things have been badly done. Perhaps it is time to stop talking about these issues only in our own closed circles. I was very pleased that the Society of Education Officers recently co-operated with us in an attempt to get 10 Chief Executives and 10 Education Officers together, but there was so much ground to make up that we only really began discussion after about three-quarters of the seminar was over. I think there were signs that a meaningful discussion was possible. That is not to say that the two sides agreed, but at least they were discussing it together. Perhaps on another occasion the Society of Personnel Officers could be brought into the same kind of discussion.

Having stated that corporate management is a response to certain pressures in our society, rather than a malign doctrine, I believe there is a need to discriminate within corporate management between those things that should be dealt with at the corporate level and those things that should not. It is a very difficult thing to do and desperately needs thought and working through. I believe that management teams are wasting too much time discussing trivia. Discrimination is part of the key, because there is a world of difference between services. I accept that education is different, so long as people do not imply that, because it is different, it is different from any other service. Social services is different, the management problems of social services are vastly different from those of education, they are vastly different from highways, but we need deep thought about these differences and how to reconcile them.

Returning to the main theme of this conference, I want to emphasize that whether education is in or out of local government, it cannot run away from the fact that people in this country are going to make hard resource choices, that they are going to see this as

being the role of politicians, that they are going to demand from professionals new forms of accountability, that the resource choices are going to involve flexibility between resources of different services and that because you have X million pounds now there is no guarantee that, when the population changes, that amount is the automatic prerogative of education in a society where many services interact with each other. There is no way that these issues can go away.

Though we may in this country have suffered almost too much from the institutional fallacy, the belief that you solve problems by changing institutions, let us look at some of the possibilities for education. If education goes out, where does it go to? Let us consider two of the possibilities. Firstly, it might go to an appointed board. Few who look at the health authority can imagine even an elementary element of stability in that. For an appointed board is not basically a legitimate board. It has no real authority in its own right. Its only authority comes from the man who appointed it, the Minister. It therefore leads in the end to a confusion of accountability. Is the education officer accountable to the board, or is he responsible to the Minister? In many ways, an appointed board, because it does not give you legitimate authority would, in the end, reduce your freedom to experiment and develop independently. You gain your power partly from the politicians, it is the politicians who legitimate. The education officer gains his authority in part from his capacity to persuade his elected members. An appointed board would merely confuse the issue.

The second possibility is direct control by the DES but if you go for that, do not believe that you are opting out of politics or of resource pressures or of the need to cope with interactions. Even if you had your own separate elections when everybody is arguing about the fragmentation of government in this country, you certainly are not opting out of politics or of resource issues.

Basically, I do not believe you can judge what is right for the government of education in isolation from what is right for the government of other services. If we move to separate education

authorities and separate health authorities, we are attempting to fragment community problems. The resource issues coupled with the population problem must involve massive changes of resources as between services. We are going to have to redeploy large resources from children's services, and maternity hospitals to the care of the elderly. We will not solve local community problems by fragmenting the services.

Let me tell you about my attitude to future reorganisation. I do not believe we can afford a new reorganisation unless it looks at the whole of the services for the local community and how they are best organised. You cannot talk about education without talking about health and without talking about social services. We must also look at how this can relate to more local community control. The Taylor debate is not merely about education, it is also about other services at more of a community level, and it looks at the resource issue as well. It is only if we solve these problems that we begin to make progress. I believe that local government would be better for education if health were also in it. Partly it would remove your vulnerability as being the big spender. More important it would recognise the unity of community services. I think the community control of schools should be rated in the same way as the community control of health centres and I think there are other services we want to think about in this relationship.

I would therefore conclude that education should not opt out, it should opt in, on the grounds that if it joins the real debate about how local communities are governed there is far more to play for and far more to influence. If you opt out you hope that the past can come back, but it will not. Society is changing so you might as well opt in to the debate.

Response by Michael Harrison,
Chief Education Officer, Sheffield

I find myself as always thrown by John Stewart because he is so lucid and so sensible one wonders why some of those who have listened to his words have so perverted them. I accept what some people said this morning about having to live with corporate management, while remembering the heroes fallen along the way in what has been a fairly difficult time. If there are certain forms of corporate management we do not like very much, we have to accept these as constraints around which we have to steer. If the system of management which has come in does not do the things which John Stewart would like it to do, because there is not the imagination there to deal with the task, then those who actually run the education service today and deliver the goods have to find different ways of doing it.

The immediate problem is a political one. Education does what it can locally and on the national scene through its political strength and that depends, of course, on having a credibility and a consensus behind it which gives it political muscle. It is because education has lost the national consensus that the education service has lost thousands of millions of pounds in resources over the last few years. Locally, there are ways in which political strength can be rebuilt or retained. Thus in Sheffield, the policy committee is being provided with an advisory group, which means that the Chief Officers who run the service will be able to make sure that the Treasurer's advice is not the only one which will be heard at that level. Avon was, of course, the barbaric example of what can go wrong when the resource philosophy is given the dominance and the primary aims and objectives of services are over-shadowed and lost. Again with regard to corporate objectives we have come to recognise that in real terms a table of objectives is a monument; once you have written it, it is a piece of stone, static and virtually useless, all you can do is look back at it. We have therefore moved to a relationship with the politicians such that our Chairmen meet in what is called an advisory section, to which the officers contribute papers, and we are thus producing in effect a moving

table of objectives. It develops from month to month and we try to adapt the budget, so far as the constricting course of the corporate management system will allow, in order to do the work we have to do.

I found the end of John Stewart's talk extremely lucid and persuasive, but the sort of world he is describing, this very difficult world of the future, is one to which I could not relate local government as I know it. Local government systems are not so competent in dealing with what they have to do at the moment, let alone these vast problems of the future which are looking up over the horizon and which the imagination of a John Stewart can see, but not many chief executives. I find it extremely difficult to see how the local government that I know contributes to the solution of these problems. I do not think, for instance, that local government in general really understands the intensity of the community feeling for education and the fact that the modern education service has become a part of the culture of this country in a way that is quite different to what it used to be. I do not think it is understood that if the teachers and administrators and politicians do not help the local education service to get its answers right about the sort of people we need to run our new post-industrial society, we are in dead lumber. At the present time we have many highly specialized people doing the wrong things. Our higher education emphases are wrong; our training and post 16 systems of education are wrong. Unless we get these things right, we are going to go on being in trouble and we are not going to be able to pay for the resources that John Stewart wants. Many of these matters have very little to do with the way that local government is organised. You could arrive at the answers to these questions through almost any system of local government. Where they have to be answered is within the educational institutions, by teachers working with parents, and with children and students.

The Taylor Report, to my mind, represents the institutionalisation of that shift of power to the community which has come to us. The articulate society is with us and there is no question of resisting it and saying that, as teachers, we will stand inside our schools and

rest upon our autonomy. It is happening in Scandinavia and Australia, in Oman and Algeria and in many other countries, as I learnt at a recent UNESCO meeting. It has nothing to do with technical sophistication. It has a great deal to do with communications and literacy and articulacy. It is a mode of operation that is sweeping the world and cannot be resisted. I think you have to accept in the long run that, if you are looking for locations of political force, they reside in the people who are the community and they reside at the level of the state which is the national concentration.

How those political pressures reside in the middle in whatever mediating organisation you have, which you call local government, is not necessarily clear. It can take many forms. What is clear to me is that whether Taylor is accepted or not, in full or at all, there is going to be a move in this country as in other countries to involve people, parents and the lay community, in the management of their own public universal education system. It is so much an integral part of their culture and their ambition to progress that it is not possible to leave them out, as you used to be able to do when there was a much smaller, more specialized sort of culture and organisation.

Finally, we have to develop a structure to relate what goes on at ground level to the national need as expressed by central government. We have to accept that the needs of the modern state are different from what they were twenty or thirty years ago. In a country like this we have to be able to change direction very quickly from time to time, or at least do some sensitive fine tuning on the tiller. This requires a national direction of education and training systems which is a good deal firmer than what we have had in the past. The problem is to know how to connect that with what I have tried to describe in the way of popular uprising from the bottom. It can be done through the present local authority system if we are fairly precise about the way we relate the one to the other through the local education authority. Taylor makes a shot at this, but is not necessarily the only answer.

I conclude by saying that the present local authority system is indeed workable, but the manner in which it works is going to change and the style and colour of it is going to change quite considerably in the very near future. But if someone proposed, as John Sayer did yesterday, that we should have regional planning authorities and school districts and that sort of thing, that also could be made to work. It is just another style of local government. I find myself, therefore, evading the question 'Education in Local Government: In or Out?'

Response by Leslie Bowles
Chairman, Bedfordshire Education Committee

A second response was provided by Councillor Leslie Bowles, then Chairman of Bedfordshire Education Committee, who argued that local government reorganisation had reduced morale in the education service and had undermined the special position of the education committee. Local education authorities, in Councillor Bowles' view, should be elected directly for the purpose of providing the education service. He considered that it was only a matter of time before responsibility for education is taken away from local government as it is constituted at present.

A REVIEW OF GROUP REPORTS

Ten discussion groups considered the issues raised by the papers and the responses. The groups met for over three hours in total, in three separate sessions. What follows is an attempt at a summary of the main themes which seem to emerge from these reports.

Although the theme of the conference was 'Education - Local Government - in or out' it seems that side issues often became dominant in discussion. The Green Paper, the Taylor Report, the Great Debate, Corporate Management were considered at great length and only rarely were possible alternatives to central or local control discussed. This may have been because the theme of the conference was misconceived or perhaps because the questions posed were not sufficiently penetrating. The latter was a criticism by one of the groups. Whatever issue one took, the debate returned to the theme of past conferences - autonomy and accountability - and it may well be that all the debate on standards, on common core, on governing bodies, on the role of inspectors, on corporate management, on the role of elected members, on institutional autonomy is related directly to this issue. Whatever the theme of the Conference it seems that we return time and time again to autonomy and accountability. Perhaps one group summed up the contemporary dilemma - 'no one knows where power lies; or perhaps it lies nowhere; or maybe it is lying around waiting for someone to pick it up'.

High on Dr. Tolley's list of freedoms was that of the freedom of the institution - institutional autonomy. One group was unhappy that there seemed to be no adequate definition of 'freedom'. This was stressed again by Spooner and by Geoffrey Winter and by speakers in discussion groups who felt that decision making should lie with those nearest the responsibility. It seemed to be agreed by most groups that an institution in receipt of public funds had not an unqualified right to freedom irrespective of the needs and wishes of the providing society. There might be some institutions

which exercised more autonomy that permissible in the public sector. One group argued in the discussions on Higher and Further Education that there could well be less institutional freedom under corporate management - but that this might well be evidence of the declining autonomy of education in a corporate management structure. The danger could be that in many institutions there could not only be a lack of control but little accountability. There were certain inevitable constraints on freedom - examination syllabuses, Regional Staff Inspectors, and the availability of resources.

The Taylor Report on Governing Bodies generated considerable discussion. It was seen as placing an emphasis on institutional autonomy with increasing pressure for accountability. Perhaps, thought some, the Governing Body might act as a buttress rather than as a buffer. There was agreement that Taylor was not a real intrusion into the Head's professionalism. Concern was expressed by one group not so much as regards the persons who would actually comprise the Governing Body, but at the fact that they would be able to 'advise' the Head on what he should be doing. The group felt that the Head had his own experts on his staff to turn to for advice. Some doubted that the new type bodies could remain unpoliticised for long. Fears of undue pressure were dismissed by one group who argued that power resides in the influence of the person at the time of decision, not in the group which sponsors or promotes except in the long run. In Higher and Further Education, however, one group felt that the post-Weaver structures had led to a decrease in the influence of elected members - more knowledge and expertise among the co-opted members, and a greater stability for individual institutions. There was a considerable measure of agreement that objectives should be stated about an institution's place in society. It was argued that institutions should draw up specific institutional aims and objectives, the methods for their implementation, and specify the means and methods of the assessment of the attainment of the objectives.

In Higher and Further Education there were certain special difficulties. Whilst there was accountability to the local electorate (polys)

on the one hand, there was also a national intake of students, and the importance of serving the national interest. The removal of a local government filter and the transfer of control to central administration could mean even fewer checks and therefore even less accountability. Moreover it should be recognised that a diminution in freedom need not necessarily take place in the context of central-local control. Perhaps Harry Gray's response summed up the groups responses well: optimum support, optimum freedom and optimum accountability, based on a system of checks and balance between central and local government control.

Matters of the curriculum in relation to central and local government control were raised mainly in the discussions following the schools paper. In some sense any control over the curriculum whether central or local or through Taylor type bodies impinges on institutional autonomy and the autonomy of the teacher. Patrick Bailey had already questioned in what sense we, as educationalists and teachers, were experts, and had looked for some definition of a return. One group argued that there were already some bodies which had more influence than central government over standards - and among examples quoted were the Institute of Bankers and CNAA. Indeed examination syllabuses for schools had the same function. Whilst there was some opposition to the imposition of standards centrally it was recognised that there might be a need for some minimum standards in literacy, numeracy and in both social and political skills. Some degree of curriculum uniformity might be inevitable in an increasingly geographically mobile society. Perhaps, thought some, an increasingly articulate society might lead to demands from clients that would lead to a more common curriculum and probably common standards. Some difficulty seemed to be experienced in what the standards of a common curriculum ought to be. In some Middle School systems some feeder schools were failing to offer a common core for entry to the secondary stage of education. One group argued that, whilst it might be agreed that Mathematics and English were an essential part of the common core, there were many kinds of English and many kinds of Mathematics, indeed it might be more difficult to change from one examining board to another than from

one school to another. Taken literally it was argued that a common curriculum would need to be specified in very great detail. In New Zealand one of the overseas visitors pointed out, there had been a common curriculum since 1942 but there was still considerable variation in curricular patterns between schools. Nevertheless groups felt that there was a need for a move towards a great commonality for at present power tended to be inevitably devolved to the classroom and some protection might be needed against the whims of the individual teacher, but one group felt very strongly that decisions in education ought to be left to the professionals.

There was little enthusiasm for a strengthened national inspectorate. Indeed one group argued that the HMI's work in recent years had been remarkably slipshod, especially with regard to the Great Debate and the Green Paper. But others were of the contrary view that teachers had a higher regard for the national inspectorate than local advisory services, although it was recognised that some LEAs had very sound advisory services. A strengthened national inspectorate to cover 30,000 schools would need five times the present 500 HMIs. The major problem seemed to be reconciling the tasks of inspection and advice.

At one point a group complained that the conference had been pussyfooting about with the title when it discussed corporate management in some detail. One group would have liked to return to the pre 1974 situation within the new authorities but this seems to have been regarded by most other groups as an unrealistic proposition. It was felt by some that corporate management had led to tension between general departments such as education and the servicing departments. Others thought that middle management was not committed to the principle of corporate management, but middle management lacked experience - not surprisingly in view of the fact that it was held that corporate management was operative really only at the top. Yet others felt that there had been no obvious advantages to education; others that the effect of corporate management had been to increase the power of party/caucus groups among the elected members. There was also a divergence of views

as to whether the current financial cutbacks had weakened corporate management. It was pointed out that the Secretary of State for Education did not control the Rate Support Grants. One group suggested that 'corporate management was a convenient bandwagon from which to defend ALL kinds of pernicious or less pernicious schemes of management, many of the variations did not look like the theory at all'. Indeed it was asked whether Bains had been implemented at all. Nevertheless examples were quoted of authorities in which corporate management had proved successful. It was clear, despite the arguments, that the current ills of the Education Service could not be blamed on ill-considered schemes of corporate management. Much of the criticism, one group claimed, was both unhealthy and hysterical. It would be taken they said 'ultimately as evidence of education's inability to function within the Local Government framework, their inability would be culpable, however, in short it stemmed from apathy, incompetence and a refusal to face the facts of life rather than from any serious grounds of objection'. There seemed to be a general recognition that what was needed was more corporate planning and less corporate management.

At times the groups came back to the main theme of the conference. The debate here was seen by some groups as being blurred by the existence of other bodies, RAC, HMI, CNAA, Examining Boards and so on. The freedom of an institution might be better guaranteed under local government (e.g. primary schools) and others under central authority (Universities, Polytechnics). Certainly the one off type of institution in an LEA area such as a Polytechnic might be better under central administration. It was argued by one group that most of the present educational system operated through official and unofficial pressure groups and that the locus of power was thereby difficult to establish. One group, however, did endeavour to examine the question of local or central control in some detail and its comments are set out below.

A. ADVANTAGES OF LEA CONTROL

1. Protective advice and guidance role of CEO where good relations exist between CEO and Heads - feeling of reciprocity.
2. Quick and effective communication between school and office - quick decisions by people not too distant from the consequences.
3. Lack of interference - education left to the professionals.
4. Generally better decisions than from centre, e.g. more sensitive on 6th form issue than DES.
5. Reasonably manageable units for administration.
6. Reflect the political element which must be present in deciding on policy in relation to public service; sensitivity to local demands.

B. DISADVANTAGES OF LEA

1. Present management structures inappropriate.
2. Lack clear terms of reference and clear specification of duties and responsibilities.
3. Self satisfaction, complacency and ignorance of the political element.
4. Lack of expertise and dynamism.

C. ADVANTAGES OF MORE CENTRAL CONTROL

1. Facilitate equalization of resourcing.
2. Facilitate introduction of common curricular elements in geographically mobile society.
3. Protect school's autonomy - DES too distant to be effective.
4. More rational administration of FE and HE.
5. Readier implementation of national policy logically by the body that is nationally accountable.

POSSIBLE NEW APPROACHES

1. NEW REGIONAL STRUCTURE

Preliminary comments were made upon the gap left by the demise of the AEC (a result it was thought of increasing politicization at the national level).

Proposal — Establishment of regional consortia of local authorities with own pooling and accounting system which would act collectively on matters for which individual LEAs were too small particularly -

(a) provision for FE and HE and whole Tertiary sector
(b) in-service education
(c) inspectoral, special advisory and technical (e.g. computer) services

This would be mirrored by complementary DES regionalisation with congruent boundaries.

Observations

(1) need for this to originate from the LEAs and not be seen to be imposed Centrally.
(2) In connection with DES reorganisation an earlier suggestion of simply having regional offices of the DES was rejected in favour of the scheme where power is seen clearly to be basically at the Local level, LEAs would send delegates to the regional board.
(3) These authorities/regions could be multi purpose and not just for education. With a corporate system, managers presumably would not welcome special and ad hoc bodies for just one service.
(4) Some precedents exist with inter LEA transport arrangements, student recruitment/grant eligibility arrangements.

(5) The proposed arrangement is similar to that which exists in New York State (BOCES?) with consortia of school boards which retain independence but act in concert by agreement.

(6) Political problems

  (a) would local authorities be prepared to cede powers?

  (b) political complexion would be important factor with regions including labour and conservative authorities.

(7) Regional disparities might remain.

II. SHORT TERM SOLUTIONS TO IMPROVE PRESENT LOCAL SYSTEMS

It was generally agreed that most rapid improvements - and possibly the best long term solution - would come from the development of more political awareness and action on the part of institutions acting either individually or better still in (interest) groups, effectively organised to bring pressure to bear on the system and expose deficiencies.

Perhaps newly constituted governing bodies would do this. Beyond a certain level of operation there needs to be a much greater understanding of the political and administrative machinery so that these groups (e.g. of heads) could penetrate the system more effectively and act as watchdogs of the political and administration system.

Whilst Harry Gray had mentioned the deschoolers, and John Sayer the Regional Dimension, others both in groups and among the respondents stressed that attempts ought to be made to make the existing system work more effectively. A number of speakers in groups elsewhere pointed out that institutions existed for their clients and that professionals by definition should be 'client orientated'. Perhaps the message of the conference was 'no change', or perhaps it is best summed up in a report from one of

the groups drawing upon the experience of their New Zealand member. In New Zealand under the previous administration the Minister of Education had wanted to abolish examinations. The Director General of Education said that the Minister had reckoned without the natural inertia of the educational system.

The group leaders were:

Mr. H.O. Jenkins	Mr. M. Hewlett	Mr. G.A.R. McHugh
Mr. B. Somers	Mr. D. Gordon	Mr. J.H. Booth
Mr. D.A. Gohl	Mr. D. Parkes	Prof. G. Baron

THE CONFERENCE IN RETROSPECT

It is, at least in part, a consequence of the complexity of the issues raised at the Conference, that many felt that no general consensus had emerged by the final session. Since then the BEAS Council of Management has considered changes which it may be appropriate to make in the structure and arrangements of future conferences, so that the Annual Conference can make a more direct contribution to the clarification of ideas and activities within the Society.

In the meantime it was felt that it might be helpful, as an Epilogue to the 1977 Conference, to invite two participants to look again at the Conference papers and to give their personal views of the papers and the responses and of the Conference as a whole. Dr. Roger Brown and Dr. D.A. Howell readily agreed to contribute in this way. Their papers are published below.

CONFERENCE REVIEW 1

Dr. Roger Brown, with the Department of Industry, was formerly with the ILEA, and was Secretary of the William Tyndale Enquiry

My chief feelings about this year's BEAS Conference, which are recalled in re-reading the Conference papers, are ones of disappointment and regret. I was sorry in particular that so little time was given to discussing the Conference theme and depressed by much of the discussion which took its place.

The theme was 'Local Government - Education - In or Out?', the essential question being whether responsibility for the provision of non-university education should remain with the existing local education authorities. Although each of the main speakers referred to this question at some point, none really squared up to it either in general terms or in relation to his particular sector. Some,

like George Tolley, favoured retaining the status quo but their reasoning seemed to me to lack precision, and therefore conviction. Others, like John Sayer responding to Robert Spooner, had a clear alternative preference - in this case regional authorities - but again the advantages and disadvantages of the preferred scheme were not fully spelled out. The main speakers having failed to get to grips with the Conference theme it was left to the groups to tackle it and this they tried to do. This meant, however, that discussion of the main theme continued to be fragmentary and diffuse.

I found this failure by the Conference to address itself to the main theme regrettable for three reasons. First of all it was regrettable because the question posed is an extremely interesting one. Secondly, because as the deliberations of the Oakes Committee and the rumours of some powers being restored to the ten largest former county boroughs show, the question remains a live and topical one. But thirdly, and most of all, because BEAS is as well-qualified a body of people as any to contribute to what seems likely to be a continuing debate about the inadequacies of the post-1974 structure (including may I suggest inadequacies which have nothing to do with the pattern of organisation of local government as such), inadequacies which will be remedied, if they are remedied at all, on an incremental basis rather than on the 'grand' scale as in 1974.

What might such a contribution have concerned itself with? It might start by identifying the range of alternative administrative structures. Eschewing a further re-organisation of local government, these might include:-

(a) Consortia of local education authorities, as hinted at by Tolley and as suggested in one discussion group;

(b) Regional local education authorities, either in addition to or instead of the existing LEAs. The case for having regional authorities to administer advanced further and higher education, including university education, has always seemed to

me to be a strong one;

(c) For at least the major institutions of further and higher education, and perhaps for all educational institutions, with or without DES regional offices (the DES being almost unique amongst 'functional' central departments in having no regional office structure). This appears to be the likely conclusion of the Oakes Committee, at least for the major colleges.

The advantages and disadvantages of each of these compared to the present structure might be enumerated.

Such a discussion would with luck have looked at questions like:-

> What real advantages accrue to an educational institution through its forming part of a local authority system?
>
> If the answer to this tends to the negative, how far are local education authorities equipped to provide, create and run educational institutions and to monitor their development?
>
> What are the disadvantages of having no "buffer" between central (or regional) government and the individual school or college? Does direct central control always amount to dirigisme?

Why did the Conference not address itself to these questions? For one speaker at least (Harry Gray) administrative structures and their alternatives were the wrong focus of attention anyway. The proper focus should be people: those who have to work the system and those who are supposed to benefit from it. This was a (self-confessedly) extreme view and once again the prescription, as opposed to the analysis, seemed to me to need clearer definition. Even those prepared to consider structures, however, clearly had other concerns, stemming from what was de facto the main theme of the Conference: the increasing involvement in educational decision-making of people who have hitherto not been so closely involved. George Tolley's paper speaks of 'elected members who ought not to be allowed within 10 miles of a school or college and

whose blundering lack of understanding is matched only by their breathtaking arrogance'. And later he speaks of 'the imposition of decisions reached in the caucus, without adequate explanation and without adequate consideration of non-local issues'. Geoffrey Winter mounted a wide-ranging attack on the practice of corporate management. Robert Spooner's paper amounted to a diatribe against the Taylor Committee's thoughts about governing bodies and the Green Paper's thoughts about education which 'taken together ... represent a clear vote of "no confidence" in schools as they function at the moment'.

I must say, with due respect to the individuals concerned, that I found all this terribly depressing. The plain fact is that at all levels, from that of the school or college up to that of the central department, groups and individuals who have not previously shown much interest in the decisions which the education professionals - teachers and administrators - make about education are now interested. The reasons for this development are too well-known to require rehearsal here but include the increasing share of national resources devoted to education, the sheer size of the education service and its preponderance within local government especially now that health services have been wholly taken out, and the fact that everyone having passed through the education system feels himself at least partly qualified to speak of educational matters. An additional tendency, which was reinforced by local government re-organisation, is for local political parties and their members to take an interest in a wider range of issues than in the past. (This of course affects most local government services but education is the largest.)

Whatever the reasons for the trend, it exists, and two responses are possible. They are reflected in the Conference papers. The first is to mount the barricades and, applying the theory that attack is the best form of defence, to attempt to undermine your opponents' arguments. This appears to be the course chosen by Robert Spooner. Nowhere in his paper, nor in his verbal presentation so far as I can recall, does one find any recognition that the concerns which parents, employers and others have voiced about certain current

educational practices - and which the politicians echo - have any validity. Nor does he accept that more should be done than is done at present to weed out weak teachers. Nor does he accept that present governing arrangements leave something to be desired in associating the local community with the work of the school.

Yet the Taylor proposals - which Spooner fears could lead to the 'coercion' (physical?) of heads and their staffs - represent the second and to my mind wiser response. They represent not a response whose very extremism invites an equally extreme response but an attempt to meet the interests of the 'external' groups and to harness them in the best interest of education. Taylor recognises that concessions should be made, and indeed have to be made, if the professionals are to retain some freedom of action.

It is less easy to see what should be the exact response at local authority level. It has to be admitted that the criticisms of Geoffrey Winter and Derek Williams have considerable force, which not even Professor Stewart in his closing contribution was able to rebut wholly. Nonetheless corporate management is not going to disappear overnight and there must be ways in which education, as the biggest local service by far and with the strongest professional component, can seek to turn the new management systems which cannot in any case be all bad to its advantage. Perhaps this - drawing upon the immense knowledge and expertise which exists among BEAS members - would be a suitable task for the working party which Tom Bone suggested. At Whitehall level there are signs that the interest of other departments - Employment, Industry - in the education service are encouraging the DES to take a more robust interest than it sometimes appears to show in the development of the service. This is just as well since the pressures I have described are unlikely to subside and should provide plenty of meat for many conferences to come.

CONFERENCE REVIEW 2

Dr. D.A. Howell, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Educational Administration, University of London Institute of Education.

The failure of most papers and responses to get to grips with the ostensible theme of the conference is disappointing on several counts. It evinced a negative and introverted attitude to the several current challenges facing the education service; it made for unco-ordinated discussion, in the course of which several hobby horses were ridden long distances in different directions; and it demonstrated unwillingness to consider the implications of alternative solutions, as opposed to simply assuming that any fire must be more congenial than the present frying pan. In a conference devoted to organisational themes, it seemed perverse on the part of some speakers to imply that questions of structure were not really all that important. These are hard words; but one whose academic and political activities involve him in the wider world of local government may perhaps be forgiven for asserting that it is now time for educational practitioners and administrators to see themselves as others see them, rather than simply to bewail their current lot, and complain how ill-used the education service is. A more positive response at the conference would have been to tackle, as indeed some speakers intimated, such matters as a definition of educational return, the assignment of responsibilities and tasks to the most appropriate level, assessing the general effects of corporate management, and considering how the claims of the public interest in education might be met.

Many of the criticisms voiced at the conference were well-founded. Bains' analysis is superficial and his prescriptions inadequate; corporate management as applied in some authorities has had a most demoralising effect on the education service; the Green Paper and the 'Great Debate' which followed, contain much that is hazy and misdirected; and the recommendations of the Taylor Committee, whether or not one condemned them as unrealistic, pose disturbing challenges to professional autonomy. And yet it is not enough, in

return, to think that horror stories about corporate management or governing bodies say all there is to be said. If it comes to that, one can counter with horror stories about Heads and schools - but what would this prove? Even if these same factors have had a very damaging effect on morale, we in BEAS could already have seen the way things were likely to go, and we could have tried to make our dispositions accordingly. After all, the theme of the 1975 conference [1], which was hardly ever referred to directly, was very similar.

It was surprising and depressing that so little recognition was given to social and political realities, and to the validity of public concern over educational standards in schools, whether on the part of parents, employers or further and higher education. There was too much of the 'everyone out of step except Johnny' feeling, and too great a tendency to dismiss expressions of public concern, however crude and uninformed, as invalid and intrusive. There could have been greater recognition too that the administrative landscape had changed significantly - whether through the advent of corporate management, the effects of reorganisation, or a chronically harsh economic climate. In these circumstances, the continuing primacy of the education service can no longer be taken for granted, nor can its claims, e.g. on teacher autonomy, be seen as providing their own justification.

Surely, too, we can make a more positive response to the challenge of corporate management? It embodies some innocuous, even beneficial, principles, and does not have to be so intrusive or inflexible as in Avon or Stockport. If education departments have to look beyond purely service objectives, to see how they might contribute more effectively to meeting the wider needs of the community as a whole, ought we not to be grateful for the opportunity which corporate management provides? Corporate management also forces us to recognise that other services can contribute to solving problems once thought of as primarily educational; and that since major educational decisions invariably impinge on other services, these services may rightly claim a share in formulating educational policy. After all, it would surely be very

wrong for a social services or housing department to come to a major policy decision without involving the education department from the outset, and particularly in defining the problem to be solved and formulating alternative solutions?

Having said that, the gap between the enunciation of these principles, and the implementation of corporate management in many authorities, is extremely disturbing, and needs, as Professor Stewart pointed out, more systematic research so that the effects of corporate management itself can be isolated from those of reorganisation or financial constraints. My own conversations with CEOs suggest that the picture is by no means uniformly gloomy, and that several authorities have been able to harness their collective resources effectively to the greater benefit of the education service, precisely because they have adopted a corporate appraisal. Nevertheless, the shortcomings of Bains' analysis, whether on the role of members, the relationship between resource and service departments and committees, or the underlying unity of local government, have provided a very unreliable and misleading sketch map for local authorities. The vagueness in his prescriptions has clearly led to great intrusion on the sphere of professional officers, and to time-wasting consultative planning machinery, while his failure to appreciate the diversity in scale and range of local authority services has shown that the same kind of attention which may well involve matters of policy or principle, e.g. in the recreation department, would amount to meddling in detail in the education service. Even so, the basic message about the need for collective appraisal of problems, and collective mobilisation and deployment of resources cannot be ignored. Certainly means for achieving effective corporate management are thwarted, when the policy and resources committee members also have commitments to individual services, and are themselves susceptible to local and political pressures: when the officers management team is widely condemned as time-wasting and useless; and when performance review over the authority as a whole is condemned as pernicious, if not written off as simply meaningless. The missionaries of corporate management must accordingly reconcile themselves to achieving more limited objectives. Moreover the

corporate managers must learn to live with education and other social services, and take greater account of the professional autonomy of schools and colleges, the increasing desire for local participation and the demands of responsive administration.

Inevitably there will be conflict between the demands of wider participation and effective overall management, and administrators will need to develop their political and managerial skills accordingly. As several speakers suggested, there is a need for more systematic preparation in these fields than now exists. The range of options within which decisions about educational priorities and allocations have to be made has increased substantially, and decision-making inevitably involves a substantial element of political choice. Judgements have to be made, if collective appraisal means anything at all, between disparate and discrete claims; but if the net result is, e.g. less money for adult education and more for road improvements, is this automatically to be condemned as wicked or perverse? It is no use bewailing the intrusion of politics into local government. Local authorities clearly act as miniature political systems in their own right, and the centre of gravity in educational decision-making has been shifted from the Education Committee to the Policy and Resources Committee and the party group (2). Educational administrators and educational politicians both need to develop those skills which will enable them to seek effective alliances, to bargain with possibly conflicting interests, and to anticipate opposition. Many practitioners find this an uncongenial prospect, and several participants expressed the view, with varying degrees of force and clarity, that the present position was past mending, and that if the education service is to operate effectively, fresh arrangements must be made for it. Clearly structures do matter, and it is quixotic to suggest otherwise (pace Harry Gray), if only because structures develop their own internal administrative style, their own responses to external demands, and also because each institution is heavily dependent on the local system. How long can the 'seamless web' argument stand up? Canon Tolley was decidedly ambiguous in

his defence of local authority involvement in the Polytechnics. These are unlikely to stay where they are much longer, whatever the specific prescriptions of the Oakes Committee may be. Moves to remove Polytechnics from local authority control may be greeted with sighs of relief on both sides, while some kind of regional structure for advanced further education is not too difficult to contemplate.

Does it follow, however, that the rest of the education service should be administered regionally? The removal of Polytechnics and institutions of advanced further education from local authority control would not necessarily deal a mortal blow to the local authority interest in education. But what is to happen to the schools? John Sayer proposes a regional authority and various CEOs have hinted at directly-elected boards [3]. In spite of Sayer's advocacy of regional authorities, it seems to me that the bureaucracy (speaking in a neutral Weberian sense) would certainly be more remote and less responsive to the individual school and its community. The role of elected members as strategic controllers would be less effective as their span widens. Some kind of distributed administration would be necessary, and before we knew where we were, we might well return to a three-tier system. Moreover, such an authority would be divorced from the control and administration of other social services, and must therefore be regarded as a retrograde step. Robert Spooner was certainly right when he said that schools needed a direct link with the LEA. This can be maintained, tenuously perhaps, in the Taylor Committee's proposals for governing bodies, but if we have 13 instead of 83 LEAs, can we really expect this link to continue effectively? In directly elected education boards the position would be even worse. They would probably share many of the features of the Area Health Authority, which is no recommendation. Nor would there be any guarantee of higher public interest or turnout at elections just because the board dealt with education only. Elections would be bound to be fought on a political basis because education is far too important for the politicians to leave out. The problems of co-ordination, bargaining and finance need only to be mentioned to start the minds of administrators and politicians boggling, and

the proposal for directly elected boards seems politically quite unrealistic.

Yells of pain and cries of ill-usage are all very well, and I would be the last to deny that many of them are entirely justified. But the claim that "they should leave us alone" whether "they" consist of politicians, chief executives, parents or community groups, will not stand up, simply because "they" think that their claims to be heard and to influence outcomes are, in principle, valid. Standing on one's professional dignity is not enough. It is a general failure of the papers and the respondents to address themselves to the question of how the present system might be improved, and to recognise, as do some CEOs in a recent survey (4) that corporate management can be exploited to the benefit of educational objectives; or to work out what kind of preparation is needed for educational administrators to fit themselves to survive in a corporate and community-oriented world; or to indicate how authority-wide appraisal might operate without impinging on effective professional running and development of education, and indeed of other educational services. Finally, the drift of argument in the Green Paper, the Great Debate and the Taylor Report proposals cannot be rejected as illegitimate either. Accepting the validity of the case for public 'general oversight of the school and the curriculum' is easy; translating this into detailed prescription is a difficult and sensitive task from which too many have shrunk. But if we ask, as we rightly do, for closer definition of the role of Chief Executives, Directors of Finance or Directors of Personnel in relation to chief officers of professional departments, how can we deny this to governing bodies when seeking to establish their precise responsibility in setting the aims and objectives of schools?

REFERENCES

(1) Autonomy and accountability in educational administration: proceedings of the fourth annual conference of BEAS (Blagdon: the Society 1975)

(2) Jennings, R.E. Education and politics: policy making in LEAs (Batsford 1977) p.190 +

(3) Fiske, D.G. Education 21.11.75 pp.543-4

(4) Neve, B. Bureaucracy and politics in local government: the role of local authority education officers. Public Administration. Aut. 77 p. 297-99

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Miss R.M. Abbott	Assistant Education Officer (Schools), London Borough of Ealing.
Mr. C.S. Allatt	Deputy Head, Great Barr School, Birmingham.
Mrs. J.E. Amery	Head of Sixth Form, Foxford School, Coventry.
Dr. S. Armstrong	Deputy Rector, Huddersfield Polytechnic
Miss M. Angus	Assistant Education Officer, West Sussex.
Mr. P. Bailey	Senior Lecturer in Education, University of Leicester.
Mr. R.J.S. Baker	Head of Department, Sheffield Polytechnic
Mr. L. Barnes	Head of Department of General Studies, Wythenshawe College of Further Education, Manchester.
Mr. B. Baron	Senior Lecturer in Personnel Management, Ealing College of Higher Education.
Prof. G. Baron	Professor of Educational Administration, University of London.
Mr. T. Barr	Director of Operations Review, South Australian Education Department.
Mr. G.R. Barrell	Headmaster, Sir John Cass & Redcoat C.E. School, London.
Mr. D.W. Bateson	Assistant Education Officer, Islington.
Mr. M.S. Beaton	Deputy Headmaster, Lea Mason School, Birmingham.
M. J. Beaussier	Research Worker, Head of Sociology of Education Unit, Institut National de la Recherche, Paris.
Mr. J. Bedford	Principal Lecturer, West Bromwich College of Technology.
Mr. J.R. Bell	Senior Lecturer in Education, Darlington College of Education.
Mr. L.A. Bell	Senior Lecturer, Coventry College of Education.

Dr. T.R. Bone	Principal, Jordanhill College of Education, Glasgow.
Mr. D.W. Boorman	Bursar, University College, Swansea.
Mr. C. Booth	Assistant Secretary, Department of Education and Science.
Mr. I.G. Booth	Senior Lecturer in Education, College of St. Hild and St. Bede, Durham.
Mr. J.H. Booth	Headmaster, St. James' Junior School, Derby.
Mr. H.J. Boulter	Assistant Education Officer, Northampton.
Cllr. L.G. Bowles	Chairman, Bedfordshire Education Committee, Bedford.
Mr. M.H. Bradley	Lecturer in Education, St. Katherine's College, Liverpool.
Dr. E.J. Brent	Principal, South Glamorgan College of Higher Education.
Mrs. C.M. Brook	Senior Lecturer in Educational Administration and History, Newman College, Birmingham.
Mr. R. Brown	Principal, Department of Industry.
Mr. D.P.J. Browning	Chief Education Officer, Bedfordshire.
Mrs. J. Clark	Headmistress, Campions Middle School, Potters Bar.
Mr. D.B. Clarke	Head of F.E. Teacher Training, Chelmer Institute of Higher Education, Chelmsford.
Mrs. M.E. Clarke	Deputy Head, Turves Green Girls' School, Birmingham.
Mr. W.A. Coote	Assistant Academic Registrar, The Polytechnic of Wales, Pontypridd.
Mr. D. Cracknell	Deputy Area Education Officer, Warwickshire.
Mr. J. Crawford	Chief Education Officer, Birmingham.
Mrs. Dacombe	Headteacher, Clipstone Brook School, Leighton Buzzard.
Mr. R.H.F. Dalton	Senior Lecturer in charge of Commonwealth Courses, University of Birmingham.
Mr. [illegible].R. Doherty	Registrar, North East London Polytechnic.

Mr. A.T. Dunlop	Academic Registrar, Burwood State College, Melbourne, Australia.
Mrs. A. Ede	Deputy Head, Foxford School, Coventry.
Mr. K. Ebutt	Principal Lecturer, Hounslow Borough College.
Dr. E.A. Ewan	Head of Department of Educational Management and Administration, Moray House College of Education, Edinburgh.
Mr. D. Falcon	Assistant Director (Forward Planning) Education Department, Humberside.
Dr. K. Fenwick	Lecturer in Educational Administration, University of Leeds.
Miss A. Finch	Course Assistant, Faculty of Educational Studies, Open University.
Mr. D. Fiske	Chief Education Officer, Manchester.
Mr. N. Fitton	Assistant Director of Education, Stockport.
Mr. A.M. Gadsby	Headmaster, Small Heath School, Birmingham.
Mr. D.A. Gohl	Deputy Director of Education, London Borough of Hillingdon.
Mr. D. Gordon	Deputy Director of Education, Borders Regional Council.
Mr. P.M. Grant	Headmaster, Feltham School, Hounslow.
Mr. H.L. Gray	Head of Organisational Studies Unit, North East London Polytechnic.
Mr. H.T.B. Harris	Executive Director, CCEA.
Mrs. A. Harrison	Deputy Principal, Madeley College of Education.
Mr. G.R.A. Harrison	Chief Education Officer, Sheffield.
Mr. M.W. Hewlett	Headmaster, Heart of England School, Balsall Common.
Mrs. C.M. Hill	
Mr. T.M. Hinds	Assistant Education Officer, Buckinghamshire
Mr. R.P. Hornung	Secretary, Middlesex Polytechnic
Miss M. Hodges	Acting Head of Educational Development, Oxford Polytechnic.

Dr. D.A. Howell	Senior Lecturer in Educational Administration, University of London Institute of Education.
Professor M.G. Hughes	Head of Department of Social and Administrative Studies, University of Birmingham.
Mr. G. Hine	Assistant Provost, London Polytechnic.
Mr. J.F. Isaac	Principal Lecturer, Sunderland Polytechnic.
Mrs. G.A. Jarrett	Second Mistress, Great Barr Comprehensive School, Birmingham.
Mr. H.O. Jenkins	Senior Lecturer in Education Management, The Polytechnic of Wales.
Mr. D.N. Judson	Deputy Head, Washwood Heath School, Birmingham.
Miss E.E. Lake	Head of School, Kettering School for Girls.
Mr. K. Lambert	Headmaster, Great Barr School, Birmingham.
Mr. M. Leech	Vice Principal, Vauxhall College.
Mr. M. Locke	Research Fellow, Centre for Institutional Studies, N.E. London Polytechnic.
Mr. D. Lovatt	Assistant Dean, Middlesex Polytechnic.
Mr. G. Lyons	Senior Lecturer, Anglian Regional Management Centre.
Mr. G.A.R. McHugh	Senior Research Fellow, The Open University.
Mr. I.G. McIntosh	Principal, Vale of Catmore College.
Dr. Mohammed A.Mannie	Faculty of Education, Riyadh University, Saudi Arabia.
Mr. R.H. Mercer	Principal Lecturer in Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic.
Dr. J. and Mrs. Miles	Newcastle College of Advanced Education.
Mr. R.G. Morris	Under Secretary (Education), Association of Metropolitan Authorities

Miss L. Morton	House Head, Finham Park School, Coventry.
Mr. D.J. Moss	Headmaster, Frowmore Comprehensive School, Camberley.
Mrs. J.P. Muir Rippon	Deputy Head, The Heathland School, Hounslow.
Miss J. Mundy	Senior Lecturer in Educational Administration, Sheffield Polytechnic.
Mr. G. Myers	Chief Education Welfare Officer, Birmingham.
Miss M. Ollis	Educational Research Executive, Longman Group.
Mr. J.B. Oliver	Deputy Head, Great Barr School, Birmingham.
Mr. J.P. O'Mahoney	Senior Lecturer Harrow College of Technology.
Mr. W.R. Oram	Lecturer in Education, University of Birmingham.
Mr. D. Parkes	Staff Tutor, Further Education Staff College, Coombe Lodge, Blagdon, Bristol.
Miss A.K. Pattison	Headmistress, Kings Norton School, Birmingham.
Mr. S.W. Percival	Principal, Charlotte Mason College of Education, Ambleside.
Mr. E.J. Phelps	Headmaster, Cockshut Hill School, Birmingham.
Mr. S. Pratt	Lecturer in Education, Bristol University.
Mr. S. Rawson	Research Fellow, Inlogov, University of Birmingham.
Mrs. M.A. Rayner	Senior Lecturer, Slough College of Higher Education.
Mr. T.D.M. Rees	Co-Ordinator, Education Centre, University of Warwick.
Mr. P.M. Ribbins	Senior Lecturer in Education, Chelmer Institute of Higher Education, Chelmsford.

Mr. P.G. Rossington	Principal, Kilburn Polytechnic.
Dr. R. Saran	Principal Lecturer in Politics, City of London Polytechnic.
Mr. P.J. Savage	Manager of Examinations Office, Middlesex Polytechnic.
Mr. J. Sayer	Principal, Banbury School.
Mr. W. Shutt	Senior Lecturer in Educational Management, Sunderland Polytechnic.
Mr. N.D. Sidaway	Headmaster, St. Aidans School, Carlisle.
Mr. D.W. Sisson	Principal Lecturer in Educational Studies, Bretton Hall College.
Mr. N.T. Small	Staff Tutor, Educational Studies, Open University.
Mr. K.F. Smart	Lecturer in Education, University of Reading.
Mr. D.M. Smith	Lecturer, University of Nottingham School of Education
Mr. B. Somers	Assistant Education Officer, Birmingham.
Mrs. R.M. Spavold	Head of Fifth Year, Foxford School, Coventry.
Mr. R. Spooner	Headmaster, Foxwood School, Leeds.
Mr. R.J. Stephens	Secretary, Thames Polytechnic.
Mr. B. Stoten	Lecturer, University of Birmingham.
Mr. J. Strawson	Chief Administrative Officer, Madeley College of Education.
Mr. B.H. Sutton	Deputy Principal, Bournemouth & Poole College.
Professor J. Stewart	Director, Institute of Local Government Studies, University of Birmingham.
Mr. A.W. Tait	Assistant Secretary, The Open University.
Mr. J.A. Taylor	Lecturer, North Glos. College of Technology.
Miss P.M. Thompson	Headmistress, Turves Green Girls' School, Birmingham.
Mr. T.W. Thornley	Senior Lecturer, Preston Polytechnic.

Mr. D.W. Tipping	Head of the Lakes School, Windermere.
Revd.Dr.Cannon G.Tolley	Principal, Sheffield Polytechnic.
Mr. S.A. Wallington	Education Officer, London Borough of Haringey
Mr. G.E. Walster	Head of Department, Queen Margaret College, Edinburgh.
Mr. D. Watson	Deputy Director of Education, Gwent.
Mr. L.E. Watson	Head of Dept. of Education Management and In-Service Education, Sheffield City Polytechnic.
Dr. J.K.P. Watson	Lecturer in Education, Reading University.
Mr. J.M. Welton	Lecturer, The New University of Ulster.
Canon K. Wilkes	Diocesan Director of Education, Bristol.
Mr. K.R. Wilkinson	Head of Education Department, College of St. Hild & St. Bede, Durham.
Mr. D. Williams	Director, Gloucestershire College of Higher Education.
Mr. G. Winter	Principal Lecturer in Educational Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic.
Mr. B.F. Withers	Head of Department of General Education, City of Bath Technical College.
Mr. R.O. Yeo	Secretary, Manchester Polytechnic.
Mrs. P.E. Young	Lecturer in Educational Administration, University of London.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership of the Society is open to individuals in the United Kingdom who are interested in promoting a fruitful relationship between practice, teaching and research in educational administration. The current membership subscription which includes membership of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and a copy of each of the Society's publications is £6 per annum. All enquiries should be addressed to R.P. Hornung, Secretary, Middlesex Polytechnic. The Burroughs, London NW4 4BT.

PUBLICATIONS SUBSCRIPTIONS

The Council of Management has instituted a Publications Subscription Rate of £6 per annum, which covers at present two issues of the Journal and the Proceedings of the Annual Conference. It is available to institutions, both in Britain and overseas, and to individuals overseas*, but carries no rights of membership of the Society. All enquiries should be addressed to the Associate Editor and Business Manager of Educational Administration, Mr. D.L. Parkes, Further Education Staff College, Coombe Lodge, Blagdon, Bristol. BS18 6RG.

*Overseas subscription for Volume 6 will be £7.50.

NOTE TO PROSPECTIVE CONTRIBUTORS

Articles and shorter notes for possible publication, as well as suggestions from members for future articles or other features are always welcomed by the Editorial Board. Text for consideration should be sent (two copies, typewritten and double-spaced) to the Editor or Associate Editor, who will be glad to be consulted when the proposed contribution is still at the planning stage.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Professor M.G. Hughes (Editor)
D.L. Parkes (Associate Editor and Business Manager)
Dennis Baylis, London University Institute of Education
(Information Officer)
J.L. Davies, North East London Polytechnic
Dr. E.A. Ewan (BEAS Honorary Secretary)
R. Glatter, Professor, Open University
R.P. Hornung (BEAS Honorary Treasurer)
M.O. Mackenzie, Senior Lecturer, University of Glasgow
G.A.R. McHugh, Faculty of Educational Studies,
The Open University

BRITISH EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION SOCIETY

COUNCIL 1977/78

Honorary President **Lord Morris of Grasmere**	
Honorary Vice-President **Professor E W H Briault**	University of Sussex

Council 1977/78

Chairman **D P J Browning**	Chief Education Officer, County Hall, Bedford
Vice-Chairman **Professor G Baron**	Professor of Educational Administration, University of London Institute of Education
Honorary Secretary **Dr E A Ewan**	Head of the Department of Educational Management and Administration Moray House College of Education, Edinburgh
Honorary Treasurer **R P Hornung**	Secretary Middlesex Polytechnic
A R Barnes	Headmaster, Ruffwood School, Kirby, Liverpool
J L Davies	Head of Department of Management in the Public Service, Anglian Regional Management Centre, North East London Polytechnic
Professor R Glatter	Professor of Educational Administration, The Open University
G M A Harrison	Chief Education Officer, Sheffield
Professor M G Hughes	Head of Department of Social & Administrative Studies in Education University of Birmingham
H O Jenkins	Department of Management Studies, The Polytechnic of Wales, Pontypridd, S Wales
K Lambert	Headmaster, Great Barr Comprehensive School, Birmingham
M L Mackenzie	Senior Lecturer in Education, University of Glasgow
G A R McHugh	Senior Research Officer, The Open University
D L Parkes	Head of Resources Group, Further Education Staff College, Coombe Lodge, Blagdon, Bristol
L E Watson	Head, Department of Education Management and In-Service Education Sheffield City Polytechnic